# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 308 CG 012 584

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | A Comparative Analysis of Delinquency Prevention Theory: Preventing Delinquency. Volume One of Nine. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Inst. for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Dept. of Justice/LEAA), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Jan 77 |
| GRANT | 75-TA-99-0016 |
| NOTE | 175p.; For related documents see CG 012 584-591, and ED 147 727 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Biological Influences; Comparative Analysis; *Delinquency Prevention; Delinquents; *Juvenile Courts; *Labeling (of Persons); *Social Behavior; *Socialization; Standards; State of the Art Reviews; *Subculture |

ABSTRACT

The Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was initiated in the Spring of 1975 by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the U.S. Department of Justice. The efforts of this task force resulted in nine reports, each one dealing with one aspect of the Juvenile Justice System. This particular volume is intended to transmit to government officials, juvenile justice personnel, legislators and concerned citizens information about delinquency prevention. Discussion falls into five major areas: (1) the breakdown of social controls, (2) delinquency as a subculture, (3) psychological theories of delinquency, (4) biological theories of delinquent behavior, and (5) labeling theory. (Author/PC)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
***********************************************************************

ED154308

C G

# A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DELINQUENCY PREVENTION THEORY

# PREVENTING DELINQUENCY

## VOLUME I OF IX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

U.S. Department of Justice

CG012584

## A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DELINQUENCY PREVENTION THEORY

# PREVENTING DELINQUENCY

## VOLUME I OF IX

Working Papers of the National Task Force
to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile
Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Prepared under Grant Number 75-TA-99-0016 from the
National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,
U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are
those of the author and do not necessarily represent
the official position or policies of the U.S. Department
of Justice.

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

U.S. Department of Justice

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME I: PREVENTING DELINQUENCY

Page

Preface. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

I. Comparative Analysis of Social Control Theories of Delinquency--The Breakdown of Adequate Social Controls. . . . . . . . . . . . 13

II. Comparative Analysis of Subcultural Theories of Delinquency--Delinquency as a Subculture. . . . 56

III. Comparative Analysis of Psychological Theories of Delinquency . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 84

IV. The Biological Bases of Delinquent Behavior. . . . 108

V. Labeling Theory. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 135

Appendix

Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses Prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 154

# FOREWORD

Over the past ten years, a number of national efforts have developed regarding juvenile justice and delinquency prevention standards and model legislation. After the enactment of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-415) and in conjunction with LEAA's Standards and Goals Program, many States started formulating their own standards or revising their juvenile codes.

The review of existing recommendations and practices is an important element of standards and legislative development. The National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NIJJDP) has supported the compilation of the comparative analyses prepared as working papers for the Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in order to facilitate this review. Over one hundred issues, questions, and theories pertaining to the organization, operation, and underlying assumptions of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention are covered in the analyses. These are divided into nine volumes: Preventing Delinquency; Police-Juvenile Operations; Court Structure; Judicial and Non-Judicial Personnel and Juvenile Records; Jurisdiction-Delinquency; Jurisdiction-Status Offenses; Abuse and Neglect; Pre-Adjudication and Adjudication Processes; Prosecution and Defense; and Juvenile Dispositions and Corrections.

The materials discussed in these reports reflect a variety of views on and approaches to major questions in the juvenile justice field. It should be clearly recognized in reviewing these volumes that the conclusions contained in the comparative analyses are those of the Task Force and/or its consultants and staff. The conclusions are not necessarily those of the Department of Justice, LEAA, or NIJJDP. Neither are the conclusions necessarily consistent with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Standrds that was established by the Act, although the Committee carefully considered the comparative analyses and endorsed many of the positions adopted by the Task Force.

Juvenile justice policies and practices have experienced significant changes since the creation of the first juvenile court in 1899. The perspective provided by these working papers can contribute significantly to current efforts to strengthen and improve juvenile justice throughout the United States.

James C. Howell
Director
National Institute for Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention
January, 1977

# PREFACE

This Volume consists of five important working papers of the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The five papers, in summary fashion, review a large body of literature about delinquency theory. They provided the foundation for the construction of the delinquency prevention standards which are contained in the forthcoming publication of the Task Force.

This Volume is intended to transmit to government officials, criminal justice planners, juvenile justice personnel, legislators and concerned citizens information about delinquency prevention which was helpful to the Task Force and which the Task Force believes will be helpful to others.

This Volume shows how action which is built upon knowledge could produce improved delinquency prevention results. It is our hope that it will be as helpful to states, localities and other agencies and persons who need information about delinquency prevention, as it was to the Task Force.

Dissemination of the Volume is also directed at overcoming the generally poor communication and methods for disseminating scientific knowledge to the professional worlds of practitioners or elected officials. Those wishing to plan and implement delinquency prevention programs are often forced to search college text books for information which might be useful in their work. Academic journals and other sources of publication are not designed to meet the needs of those making social policy in the delinquency field. With few exceptions, the worlds of theory are isolated, detached. They rarely intersect to even make mutual communication possible. Clearly the separation of theory and practice in the prevention area has harmed the efforts of all those involved in research and action.

Portions of this Volume will sound "academic" to many practitioners. Some academics, in turn, will remind practitioners that good theory will not overcome poor planning or improper program development and implementation. Collaboration between academic scholars and practitioners may need to suffer through these kinds of criticisms. The important point is that members of the Task Force believed that their efforts at generating standards were substantially improved through conscious efforts to merge the wisdom of theory and good practice.

We hope this report stimulates future collaboration of academicians, policy makers, citizens and practitioners within the field of delinquency prevention. We hope it stimulates a fuller and more critical dialogue amongst practitioners, citizens and academics so we can advance our common objective of reducing the rate of juvenile delinquency.

The readings contained here were made possible by a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which provided funds to support the work of the Task Force. The American Justice Institute provided staff support for the Task Force and served as the organizational trustee for the grant funds which were provided by LEAA to support the work of the Task Force.

The American Justice Institute commissioned the work in this Volume. Dr. Barry Krisberg, Assistant Professor, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, California, served as a lead consultant to locate and supervise the development of the papers. He also edited them and prepared much of the material which is contained in the introductory section. The overall effort was supervised by Robert Cushman, the Executive Director for the Task Force.

Several authors need to be given credit for their contribution to this Volume. It should be recognized, however, that their work has been edited, first as a result of an independent review of their work by other prominent scholars, and by Dr. Krisberg and then by Mr. Cushman who assumed final editorial responsibility for assembling the Volume. Any errors or omissions are not necessarily the responsibility of these authors.

The persons who drafted papers are:

Joseph Weis (Social Control)
Department of Sociology
University of Washington

Terence Thornberry (Subculture)
Center for Studies in Criminology
and Criminal Law
University of Pennsylvania

Marc Riedel (Subculture)
Center for Studies in Criminology
and Criminal Law
University of Pennsylvania

Isami Waugh (Labeling & Psychology)
School of Criminology
University of California, Berkeley

Robert Dunbar (Psychology)
Department of Sociology
San Francisco City College

Robert Figlio (Biological)
Center for Studies in Criminology
and Criminal Law
University of Pennsylvania

We are also indebted to the following persons who reviewed the papers and provided helpful guidance and constructive criticism.

Gilbert Geis
Program in Social Ecology
University of California, Irvine

Bernard Diamond, M.D.
School of Criminology
University of California, Berkeley

James Short
Boystown Center
Stanford University

And, we want to especially thank Dr. Barry Krisberg, Assistant Professor, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, California, who helped lead the effort, and Dr. LaMar Empey, Sociology Department, University of Southern, California, Los Angeles, California, who provided such helpful guidance to the Task Force at their workshop on delinquency theory.

# INTRODUCTION

This Volume presents background papers concerning delinquency prevention which were prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. These papers provide a review and comparative analysis of the theoretical literature on juvenile delinquency in summary form. The delinquency theories have been classified into five subject areas as follows:

- Social Control Theories; that is, theories which link delinquency to a breakdown in adequate social controls.
- Subcultural Theories, in which delinquency originates because of the development and maintenance of delinquent subcultures.
- Psychological Theories.
- Biological Bases of Delinquent Behavior.
- Labeling Theory, which is concerned with the negative effects of identifying a juvenile as a delinquent.

## The Reasons for the Development of the Papers

The American Justice Institute commissioned the five background papers to achieve three objectives.

First, since the Task Force was to concern itself with delinquency prevention, there was a need to help the Task Force gain a working knowledge of the major theories of delinquency. The preparation of several short "state of the art" reviews, even though they would be highly summarized, seemed like one good way to accomplish this objective; especially, if after reading the papers, the Task Force could discuss them at a workshop set up specifically for this purpose.

The Task Force believed that one of the central principles of delinquency prevention should be that action be based upon knowledge. Work in the field of prevention has, too often, proceeded according to whim or wish rather than firm information.

Nearly a decade ago, criminologist Peter Lejins concluded that prevention was one of the least developed areas within criminology. He characterized the theoretical bases of most prevention work as "moralistic beliefs, discarded criminological theories of bygone days, and other equally invalid opinions and reasons" (Lejins in Amos & Wellford, 1967).

The reviews contained in this Volume make it clear that there is a great need to expand our knowledge base, but we can begin to improve our efforts by the informed use of the existing body of research and theory in delinquency and human behavior. The method used by the Task Force attempted to do just that--make informed use of the state of the art. The review of delinquency theories proved useful in eliminating ideas that had little or no scientific bases. While it pointed out the limits of our present knowledge about workable prevention strategies, it also showed how the strategic use of our current, though partial, knowledge can be used to facilitate discussion about delinquency prevention strategies and policies, and serve as a foundation on which specific delinquency prevention action programs and projects can be constructed.

As a result of this process, each of the standards on delinquency prevention is solidly based on material contained in the background papers. The commentary under each standard contains a brief rationale which links the action urged by the standard to research and theory in the delinquency field.

A second reason for preparing the papers revolved around the staff's attempt to develop "comparative analyses" for the Task Force. In the prevention area the papers were to serve as a substitute for the comparative analyses which were being prepared concerning police, judicial process and corrections. In those areas, comparative analyses were being prepared to summarize and clearly set forth possible options the Task Force could take on key issues. The comparative analyses were to help the Task Force separate out the various stances they might take on any given issue, set forth the pro and con arguments for each stance, summarize current practices of the states concerning the issue, and set forth the positions which had been taken by major standards-setting groups. With the comparative analyses before them, the Task Force could then be in a better position to formulate standards. And the standards would be based on sound and relevant information.

In the prevention area there are no state juvenile codes to turn to, and the positions of the major standard-setting groups are often not clear. Thus, a comparative analysis could not be completed--at least a comparative analysis of the type being completed for other subject areas of the proposed Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention standards volume. The preparation of the five background papers then served as an alternative method for developing delinquency "comparative analyses" in the prevention area.

The third reason for undertaking the compilation of these background papers centered on the belief that it is necessary to clarify assumptions about what causes delinquency before deciding what to do about it. The papers helped the Task Force members clarify their own assumptions.

Naturally, as with any group of people, there were great variations among the beliefs and assumptions of Task Force members concerning the causes of delinquency, and what needs to be done about it. It became clear to members of the Task Force that differences among theories often consisted of differences in some very basic assumptions about human nature. Most of these assumptions are ultimately untestable and, therefore, theories cannot be evaluated independently of one's own assumptions and values. It was only through extensive discussion that general direction for the prevention material could be achieved. By helping Task Force members clarify their own assumptions, the papers made it easier to reach consensus on the standards. It also made it easier for the staff to construct draft standards which were responsive to the wishes of the Task Force.

## What the Authors Were Asked to Do

In commissioning these papers, the American Justice Institute asked each author to summarize the underlying assumptions of the theories in each subject area and to discuss the empirical or factual assertions of each theory. Theories were compared in terms of fundamental differences in their underlying assumptions and each theory was compared with the available research evidence. Finally, authors were asked to develop examples of the public policy implications which might be derived from the various theories; that is, since each theory sets forth assumptions about what causes crime, the theories, by implication, should also suggest appropriate public action to reduce delinquency. Thus, the authors were asked to set forth example recommendations for action. These are merely illustrative and should not be confused with "the correct" or "complete" set of programs to be drawn from each theory.

## The Papers

The paper on social control perspectives summarizes a wide body of theory which links delinquency to social and cultural breakdowns. Research in this area has been dominated by sociologists and continues to be highly regarded within the academic community.

Subcultural theories are properly understood as a variety of the social control perspective. A special paper was devoted to the subcultural school because of the high prestige of this body of theory within criminology and among some juvenile justice system practitioners.

The paper on psychological perspectives focuses upon areas of psychological theory and research in the area of socialization. As the authors rightly point out, the literature on socialization is empirically sound and scientific and offers many useful clues to prevention programming. Psychological work on the relationship of intelligence, psychopathology, neurosis or specific types of personality to delinquency has not been methodologically rigorous nor do these areas offer many usable suggestions for social practice in the delinquency field.

The paper on biological factors in crime and delinquency provides an extensive review of the available research literature. On balance, the author concludes that this literature offers few strong policy suggestions for prevention programming. Biological factors seem to always be mediated by social processes which are more amenable to social intervention. Thus, it is not the biology of the hyperactive child which "causes" delinquency, but the unappropriate social response of parents, teachers and others to the behavior of these children. Early diagnosis of medical or nutritional problems coupled with humane and constructive social responses can generally eliminate the potential for biological differences to become defined as delinquency. Despite the overall negative character of the review of biological research on delinquency, this paper is quite important because of the continued "rediscovery" of alleged biological causes of crime. In most cases the "rediscoveries" are not supported by firm research findings or they represent ideas long since discredited in the scientific literature.

The final paper on the emerging labeling perspective on delinquency is briefly reviewed and its major ideas summarized. The labeling view is both methodologically and theoretically at odds with other theories within the field and offers insights into prevention practice which differ considerably from conventional approaches. Although the labeling view requires a good deal more theoretical and empirical refinement, the key concepts of this school merit serious consideration by prevention planners.

It is important to remember that the various theories are presented in a highly summarized form. This presentation tends to simplify the complexity and logic of the ideas being discussed. Authors were encouraged to make choices to delimit the topics to manageable and useful proportions. This often meant that authors passed over theoretical positions which were popular in the past but which have little scientific following today. In other instances, limiting decisions were made on the basis of the probable utility of a body of theory to prevention efforts. For example, the disciplines of biology and psychology are quite extensive but there exist areas which are more closely related to delinquency prevention than other topic areas.

Nevertheless, the authors of these reviews have provided extensive literature citations or bibliographies which should be of assistance to practitioners and/or academicians who wish to do further work. Searches were made in all reports of relevant national commissions. Staff consulted reports by several states and reviewed all pertinent delinquency prevention publications for the last several years, including the leading journals in the fields of health, housing, education and family services. In sum, an exhaustive program of research was conducted to pull together the best professional wisdom on the subject of delinquency prevention and the related human service fields.

## Review of the Papers

The commissioned papers were sent to other prominent behavioral scientists for review and criticism, and the reviewers were asked to suggest alternative policy implications that might be reached through comparative analyses of the theories.

## The Task Force Review

Copies of the papers were sent to members of the Task Force in advance of a workshop meeting on the subject of delinquency prevention. The Task Force, assisted by the American Justice Institute staff, and consultants Barry Krisberg and LaMar Empey, engaged in a day-long discussion of delinquency prevention issues. The findings of delinquency research were presented to the Task Force. Discussion was geared toward an understanding of the theories and the development of tentative programmatic policies which would flow from the theoretical base.

Soon afterwards the consultants and staff constructed a preliminary list of possible draft standards in the prevention area. The list was sent to the Task Force members. They were asked to comment and add to the list. Once returned to the staff, this became the basis for the preliminary draft of the standards in the prevention area.

Draft standards and commentaries were presented to the Task Force at subsequent meetings. Many changes were made as Task Force members made specific suggestions. They also offered additional programmatic standards which were further researched and developed by the staff.

## Translating Delinquency Theory Into Prevention Practice

Many problems exist which prevent the successful translation of delinquency theory into practice. It should be noted that few of the theories enjoy empirical support and that several of the theoretical positions lack the sign of logical consistency. Delinquency theory, like most theory in the social sciences, lacks the predictive precision which would be ideal for formulating social policy.

Another problem is the diversity of persons and behaviors which are lumped together under the general category of "delinquency." Theories are asked to explain such divergent phenomena as gang violence, glue sniffing, theft and curfew violations. Clearly a typological approach to delinquent behavior is required to specify more precise relations between causal factors and actual descriptions of behavior.

Perhaps the most difficult problem is the level of generality of the theories; this limits the ability to make unambiguous policy choices based upon specific theories. For example, one theory suggests that we expand the structure of legitimate opportunities for youth. This could mean starting programs of job training or it might refer to wholesale changes in national economic policy. Thus, if we were to initiate a particular program and observe no measurable results, we cannot conclude that the theory is faulty. Alternatively, the failure of a program might suggest that the level of effort was insufficient, the nature of the target population incorrect, or that there were problems in implementing the dictates of the theory.

While these problems of translating theory into practice will always persist, there remain several good reasons for trying to improve our ability to use what we do know. First, we know that the critical review of theories can help us eliminate false directions of social policy and provide the basis for planning general directions of prevention policies. Second, delinquency theories provide a sensitizing framework which permits the clarification of underlying assumptions. They force users to make bases and assumptions more explicit and thus contribute to a more open and thorough policy discussion. Lastly, it assures that public policy will be guided by our best knowledge.

The standards and commentary which have been produced by the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention shows that theory can serve public objectives--that theoretical work can be successfully translated into meaningful social practice.

The five papers which follow summarize the state of the art of delinquency theory. The standards and commentaries contained in the forthcoming standards volume have been constructed on the foundation provided by these papers.

Taken together, this Volume and the standards volume should provide sound, practical guidance to states and localities that seek to reduce delinquency rates.

## I - COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL CONTROL THEORIES OF DELINQUENCY--The Breakdown of Adequate Social Controls

The essence of the social control perspective is that the weakening, breakdown, or absence of effective social control accounts for juvenile delinquency. This perspective incorporates the major sociological theories of delinquent behavior, and its inclusivity can lead to the tentative conclusion that sociology has only one theory of delinquent behavior.[1] This conclusion is even more tenable when one realizes that two of the three major theories of delinquent behavior, "strain" and "control" theory,[2] emerge directly from Durkheim's (1897) theory of the "one cause of suicide" (cf. Johnson, 1965).

Durkheim (1897) proposed that abnormally high or low levels of social integration ("altruism" and "egoism" respectively) and of social regulation ("fatalism" and "anomie" respectively) generate high suicide rates. A society is "integrated" to the extent that its members are morally bonded to each other through interaction, a commitment to common societal goals, and sharing a "collective conscience" (or "culture"). As Durkheim (1961: 64) put it, "We are moral beings to the extent that we are social beings." A society is "regulated" to the extent that social control is exerted over the individual by custom, tradition, mores, rules, the law, and other social constraints. Johnson's (1965) analysis of these theories of suicide leads to the conclusion that altruism and fatalism are vacuous theoretically, and that egoism and anomie are the same conceptually. Therefore, the higher the level of egoism/anomie in a society, the higher the suicide rate. The less integrated and less regulated a society, the higher the suicide rate.[3] For Durkheim, ineffective social control explains suicide. Some criminologists have developed theories of juvenile delinquency from this general social control model.

Three major theoretical perspectives on delinquent behavior are encompassed by the social control perspective. Two of them, control theories and social structural disorganization, come directly from Durkheim's theory, while the third, cultural disorganization, is closely related. All three perspectives rest on the basic idea that "deregulation" and "malintegration" are vital to an explanation of delinquent behavior, but each emphasizes different aspects of ineffective social control.

The purest type of social control theory, known as "control" theory, asserts that delinquent behavior occurs when an individual's moral bonds to the conventional order are weak, broken, or absent (Reiss, 1951; Nye, 1958; Reckless, 1956, 1961; Matza, 1964; Hirschi, 1969). "Social structural disorganization" theory proposes that the frustrated desire to conform to the conventional order causes nonconformity (merton, 1937; Cohen, 1955; Cloward and Ohlin, 1961). Added to deregulation and malintegration (anomie), is a motive to deviate--frustration. Ironically, this motive seems to be generated among individuals who aspire to conventional values but are denied the opportunity to achieve them. "Cultural disorganization" theory posits that conformity to cultural standards that are in conflict with those of conventional society cause juvenile delinquency (Shaw and McKay, 1929, 1942; Sutherland and Cressey, 1970; Miller, 1957). In this last case a satisfied, rather than a frustrated, desire to conform to an unconventional order causes nonconformity.

Although the different social control theories share intellectual origins and the basic assumptions of the social control perspective, they are as different as they are similar. In general, they differ in their-analysis of the causes of ineffective social control. More specifically, they accord differential importance to socialization or social constraint in the social control process and they emphasize different units of social control. Within the social control perspective, society exercises social control over its members in two ways: socialization and social constraints. Social control (or order) is achieved through socialization and maintained through social constraints. Socialization consists of direction, education, and training which are directed toward the establishment of internal moral controls. Man is potentially social and learns how to be an orderly, social, and moral being. Socialization is considered by some sociologists to be the "basis of the society's power to control the individual" (cf. Landis, 1939: 43). Others emphasize the importance of social constraints or sanctions. Society induces (through rewards) or coerces (through penalties) individuals to conform to societal imperatives. These external social constraints are typically anchored in the economy, where monetary rewards are exchanged for conformity, and in the state, where force and punishment, usually incorporated in the law, are the favored strategies of control. In short, social control is effective when socialization "integrates" and social constraints "regulate" the individual, making him a moral and orderly being and, in the process, creating and maintaining social order. Social control is ineffective when socialization and/or social constraints are inadequate.[4]

The implications of the social control perspective for delinquency prevention are abstract and difficult to operationalize. It informs us that delinquency can be prevented by making social control effective. And this can be accomplished by improving the system of social constraints and the socialization process. Increasing utilization of negative sanctions may improve social control but at the cost of oppression, coercive authority, and the loss of individual liberties. A fascist society is certainly a controlled society. Improving the system of positive sanctions is more palatable in a democratic society and is probably more effective. The inference that the socialization of youngsters should be improved points to the other major difference among social control theories--the relative importance given to different units of control (or socialization institutions) in the process of socialization. For example, some theories accord primary significance to primary groups like the family, while others stress the importance of secondary groups like the school.

## A. Social Structural Disorganization: Anomie, Strain, Means-End and Differential Opportunity

Social structural disorganization theories of delinquent behavior have been characterized as the result of "good answers to a bad question" (Hirschi, 1969: 4).[5] The question was posed by Thomas Hobbs (1957), "Why do men obey the rules of society?" The good answer is "desire," while the Hobbesian answer is "fear" of the consequences of violating the rules. Whereas Hobbesian man is antisocial and immoral, the concept of man which underlies structural disorganization theory is homo duplex--man has a self-interested and a social nature.[6] Man desires to conform because of his moral nature and because it is in his best interest. Structural disorganization theory (Merton, 1937) proposes that basically moral members of society are readily and almost universally socialized to aspire to the cultural goals of pecuniary and social success and that the "good life" is the reward for those individuals who are diligent and conform to societal imperatives. Conformity is exchanged for rewards because of motives of self-interest.

According to structural disorganization theory, people deviate when their self- and socially-motivated desires to conform to the conventional order are frustrated. Frustration is the motive to deviate among individuals who aspire to conventional values but are denied the opportunity to achieve them. "Opportunity" is the key to understanding this theory because the lack of opportunity and the resulting frustration constitutes the dynamic mechanism of the theory. Merton (1937), borrowing from Durkheim, proposes that anomie and crime result from a disjunction between cultural goals (ends) and socially structured approved means to their attainment. The opportunity to realize one's aspirations is denied because of social structural disorganization. The theory is a formal elaboration of the common-sense notion that "the end justifies the means." When a society places undue stress on the achievement of certain cultural goals, unregulated aspiration (anomie) may lead people to use any means, including illegal ones, to attain them. According to

Merton (1937), there is, indeed, a cultural exaggeration of the goal of pecuniary success in our society and a class differential in access to the legitimate means to achieve the "good life." Individuals who occupy lower class positions within the social structure do not have the same opportunities for achievement. They are at a disadvantageous position in the competition for the economic rewards which define success and insure conformity. When an individual's aspirations are unfulfilled because of social structural barriers, frustration (strain, pressure, anxiety, stress) is generated. This personally experienced frustration constitutes the motivation to use illegitimate means because it can be decreased or relieved only by achieving the valued end.[7] In short, in a society where aspirations are not controlled or regulated, an individual who is properly socialized to the paramount cultural value of economic success but who is precluded from its attainment via legitimate avenues because of his lower class position, will turn to illegitimate means. The same kind of rewards can be obtained in other ways and in other social contexts.[8]

The importance of socially structured lack of opportunity in the generation of delinquent behavior and in delinquency prevention is most apparent in the "differential opportunity" theory of Cloward and Ohlin (1961) and, to a lesser extent, in the "status deprivation" theory of Cohen (1955), both of which are theories specifically of juvenile delinquency that build upon Merton's more general theory of crime. Both theories view juvenile delinquency as an urban, male, lower class, and collective phenomenon, primarily because the theorists rely on reports and statistics of officially-designated delinquents.[9]

Within the general social structural disorganization model, Cohen (1955) emphasizes different aspects of aspiration and achievement. For youngsters the paramount goal is "status," instead of pecuniary success, and the context of competition for this reward is the "school," rather than the economic marketplace. He proposes that the motivation to engage in delinquent behavior is generated out of the experiences of lower-class boys in the "middle-class-dominated institution" of the school. School officials define success and awards status according to middle-class standards which are basic to the curriculum, methods of teaching and selection of personnel. However, there is "unequal opportunity" in the competition for the status rewards that the school has to offer in exchange for "adjustment" (vis. conformity). Cohen asserts that lower-class youngsters start at a disadvantage relative to middle-class youngsters; they have less money, their parents may not be formally educated, there are few books in their home, they have limited travel and other educational experience. Additionally, Cohen believes that cultural values of students are often alien to or in conflict with those of their predominantly middle-class teachers. More importantly, their experiences and cultural values are not deemed valid by curriculum writers. This not only establishes them as different from the "average" student but as prime candidates for the label of troublemaker.

Lower-class youngsters are deprived of an equal opportunity to compete and succeed in the school--one of the major paths to social mobility in our society. Consequently, lower-class youth are faced more often with "problems of adjustment" within the school setting. They do not perform academically as well as middle-class students, are more likely considered behavior problems, are accorded less status, and, as a result, are more likely to become frustrated by their relative failure. Cohen's theory suggests that these youth seek a solution to this "status deprivation" and find it, collectively, in the delinquent gang culture. The delinquent group provides an alternative--social context within which to achieve the status which has been denied some youth in school and to regain a sense of positive self-esteem in the face of harsh, negative evaluations of their worth. The gang youth, according to Cohen, achieve status by adhering to values which are at times just the opposite of those middle-class values proffered in the school setting. The reward of status is now dependent upon conformity to the values of a sub-group of delinquent peers.

Cloward and Ohlin (1961) refine the general social structural disorganization model and attempt to integrate it with cultural disorganization theory in their "differential opportunity structure" theory of juvenile delinquency. They offer two important additions to social structural disorganization theory. One is the notion that in addition to differential access to legitimate means to success goals, there is differential access to illegitimate means. The other is that different types of delinquent groups are generated in different types of community cultural context. They propose that there are two opportunity structures (legitimate and illegitimate) and that youngsters who cannot achieve economic success in the legitimate opportunity structure may find that it is not universally available nor easily achieved in the illegitimate opportunity structure. A delinquent solution to the frustration created by blocked access to legitimate opportunity is not automatic. According to Cloward and Ohlin, the ability to utilize illegitimate means depends on the "organization" of the community; the type of illegitimate opportunity structure determines the modal type of delinquent behavior that is available to youngsters in a community.

For Cloward and Ohlin, the type of delinquent group that is generated--criminal, conflict or retreatist--depends on the extent to which the illegitimate opportunity structure has "integrated" different age groups and the overlap of persons holding conventional and criminal values within a community. Delinquent gangs and criminal subcultures emerge in communities where the illegitimate opportunity structure is integrated or organized for maintenance of criminal activities. The community may have a "tradition" of crime, intricate patterns of interaction among police, thieves, fences, lawyers, politicians, and citizens and youngsters in these communities are influenced by adults who may be involved in criminal activities. Older criminals select and recruit good prospects, bring them up through the ranks, and, at the same time, attempt to keep them from becoming involved in open conflict, violence, dope, and other behavior that might create "trouble" for criminal enterprises in the community.

"Thus the behavior of the young is encompassed within a system of social controls that originates in both legitimate and illegitimate sectors of the community" (Ohlin, 1973). Conventional adults control the distribution of legitimate rewards for conformity to the conventional order, and criminal adults control the distribution of illegitimate rewards for conformity to the criminal culture in the community. And paradoxically, the illegitimate social controls support many of the conventional values, prohibitions, and controls and, thereby, encourage conventional and criminal behavior while discouraging (and controlling) more culturally undesirable delinquent conduct (e.g., drug addiction, gang fights). In short, legitimate and illegitimate social controls determine whether there will be typically conventional or delinquent adaptations among youngsters in a community, and illegitimate social controls determine the particular type of modal delinquent behavior.

Conflict gangs and subcultures emerge in malintegrated communities, where there is limited access to legitimate and illegitimate opportunity structures. Cloward and Ohlin believe that intensified frustration generated by blocked opportunity, together with inadequate conventional and criminal social controls produces hostility, conflict and violence. Profitable conventional and criminal behavior patterns are not available, so status (gaining attention, recognition, respect and deference from others) is achieved through violent means.

Delinquent retreatists may appear in integrated or malintegrated communities. They are viewed as "double failures" because they cannot achieve success through legitimate or illegitimate means. In a community organized for crime they may not become juvenile criminals because they are not considered trustworthy, sharp, or physically capable by the adults who control access to the illegitimate opportunity structure. In a malintegrated community they may not be big enough or tough enough to succeed as a street-fighter. Another possibility is that they may have moral prohibitions against victimizing crimes or fighting. In short, they "can't make it" in the conventional or criminal opportunity structures. Therefore, they retreat from both and turn to drugs as a means of withdrawal, escape or retreat.

All three delinquent adaptations seen in this theory are the consequence of differential access to legitimate and illegitimate opportunities to achieve those economic and occupational rewards that define success in our culture. Those youngsters who are denied "equal opportunity" to participate, compete and achieve are prime candidates for juvenile delinquency. Implications for the prevention of juvenile delinquency revolve around the strategy of equalizing opportunity for youth at the bottom of the social structure.

Implications for Prevention. Social structural disorganization theory suggests that an effective strategy of delinquency prevention must rest upon (1) modification of cultural value emphases and/or (2) alterations in the social structure (cf. Schur, 1969: 230-2). This theory suggests that the disjunction between deregulated aspirations and opportunities to achieve them must be brought into balance. One tactic is to restore social control over aspirations by devaluing the cultural goal of educational-occupational-economic success on a societal basis, and, especially, among those youngsters who occupy positions in the social structure which might preclude its attainment. This is often referred to as inculcating youngsters with "realistic aspirations," but it also may be seen as an attempt to "cool them out" and fatalistically resign lower-class youth to an unfortunate position in life. A preferable alternative would be to acknowledge that there are, indeed, unequal opportunities to realize personal aspirations. One's position in the social structure does affect the chances to achieve, but that there are ways to transcend social position and to change those social conditions that are responsible for unequal opportunity. Another possibility is to rethink or broaden the conception of "achievements" to recognize the talents of a larger pool of individuals. Transcendence of class position is difficult to achieve, however, unless there is "greater attention to problems of social structure and social justice than has generally been the case in previous approaches to prevention" (Ohlin, 1963: 193). Focusing on the social structure and changing the social conditions that create unequal opportunity has been and seems to be a more promising tactic than attempting to devalue cultural goals or to regulate people's aspirations.[10]

If differential opportunity causes delinquent behavior, then it can be prevented by equalizing opportunity, which can be accomplished by eliminating those social conditions that block access to equal opportunity. The barriers to opportunity which are emphasized in social structural disorganization theory are structural; for example, one's position in the class structure is a primary determinant of conforming or nonconforming behavior.[11] One might infer, incorrectly, that this implies that an efficacious prevention strategy would be the creation of a "classless" society where privilege based on ascription or achievement would be eliminated. To the contrary, social structural disorganization theorists propose that there should be equal opportunity to compete for artificially-scarce economic and social rewards. Everyone deserves to be prepared equally for the competition, but there will still be winners and losers who will receive differential rewards. In fact, this is how the class structure or privilege system is legitimated, created and maintained.

What is implied is that "It is insuring opportunity that is the basic goal of prevention programs" (Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, 1967: 41). Those conditions which unjustly[12] obstruct legitimate aspiration and achievement should be compensated for, neutralized, or eliminated. Inequality of access to legitimate opportunities may be a consequence of class position, race, family socialization, school experience, employment opportunities, and community environment. Youngsters who are relatively "deprived" in these areas are at a distinct disadvantage in the competition for the good life.

> Society's efforts to control and combat delinquency may be seen as operating at three levels. The first and most basic--indeed, so basic that delinquency prevention is only one of the reasons for it--involves provision of a real opportunity for everyone to participate in the legitimate activities that in our society lead to or constitute a good life: education, recreation, employment, family life. It is to insure such opportunity that schools in the slums must be made as good as schools elsewhere; that discrimination and arbitrary or unnecessary restrictions must be eliminated from employment practices; that job training must be made available to everyone; that physical surroundings must be reclaimed from deterioration and barrenness; that the rights of a citizen must be exercisable without regard to creed or race (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967: 88).

In this view social change is necessary to provide more opportunities for more people. The federal government has supported a number of efforts to expand equality of opportunity, most of them in the areas of education and employment. These programs are usually not designed specifically to prevent delinquent behavior, but "some of the most valuable policies for dealing with delinquency are not necessarily those designated as delinquency policies" (Schur, 1973: 167).[13] Efforts to expand educational and employment opportunities attempt to compensate for whatever deficits may be attached to growing up in urban communities characterized by poverty, physical deterioration, inadequate schools, family disorganization, high rates of unemployment, and availability of criminal opportunities. The Office of Economic Opportunity was the federal government's institutional expression of this liberal ideology of social problems amelioration.

A number of programs were initiated in the decade of the 1960's to expand and equalize opportunities for the victims of economic and cultural deprivation and of racial discrimination. For example, Project Head Start was a compensatory education program for preschoolers which attempted to provide disadvantaged children with the same educational and cultural preparation for school as their more advantaged peers. Evaluation of pre-school programs showed some improvement in the educational readiness of disadvantaged children, especially in the area of motivation (Coleman, 1966: 516). However, there was evidence that the pre-school gains deteriorate after the children enter elementary school. Declines in IQ scores have been observed *after* the children entered school (Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity, 1966: 20). Perhaps this suggests the need to make improvements in the quality of education throughout the grade levels.

Manpower Development and Training Act programs, the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Youth Opportunity Centers and other similar programs were directed at improving employment opportunities. These work programs have had mixed success (cf. Census Bureau, 1973: 138, Cassell, 1966; Robin, 1969; Hackler, 1966), probably because the specific programs attempt to correct *individual* handicaps by providing prevocational education, vocational training, job counseling, placement services, work-training, and so on. Job-related programs are worthwhile endeavors and certainly prevent many young people from turning to crime, but these programs often disregard the structural barriers to employment that create higher unemployment rates among youth in an economy where a five percent unemployment rate is considered desirable and the current rate is more than twice this tolerable limit. If there are not jobs awaiting those who finish training programs, employment in the illegal marketplace becomes an alternative.

A problem with some of the youth opportunity programs seems to have been circumvented in a project based explicitly on "differential opportunity" theory (Cloward and Ohlin, 1961).[14] Mobilization for Youth served a *community* in New York City by providing "an integrated approach to the environmental system which in our view produces delinquency" (Bibb, 1967: 175). In addition to efforts to improve and create new employment opportunities in the community, Mobilization for Youth pursued an active community organization effort which attempted to coordinate social services and to promote social change in those areas which affect residents of the community (e.g., neighborhood legal services, tenants' unions, volunteer tutoring, voter registration, political lobbying). The employment component was similar to other work-training projects, except that it was community-anchored, reflecting the importance attached to community organization. As Cloward and Ohlin (1961) suggest, there were increases in legitimate opportunities and a concomitant decrease in illegitimate opportunities. The community must be organized in such a way that access to the illegitimate opportunity structure is restricted (or it is eliminated). Cloward and Ohlin suggest that community solidarity is essential to delinquency prevention. Social control is more effective when it springs from within the community and youngsters are more responsive to concerned adults *of* the community than to outsiders.

## Summary

The implications of social structural disorganization theory for the prevention of juvenile delinquency can be summarized as follows:

1. The motivation to engage in delinquent behavior can be neutralized by establishing a balance between aspirations and opportunities for achievement.

The disjunction between aspirations (cultural values) and opportunities for achievement (socially structured means) can be corrected by controlling aspirations, opportunities, or both.

2. Aspirations, especially for economic and social success, should be socially regulated.

Regulating aspirations does not mean lowering aspirations to coincide with status position. Instead, those cultural values implicated in the etiology of delinquent behavior (such as "cutthroat" competition, race or sex prejudice and the fetish of material possession) should be devalued and those which support equal opportunity should be pursued more diligently.

3. The key to delinquency prevention is the expansion and equalization of access to legitimate opportunities to achieve.

Educational and employment opportunities, in particular, must be made accessible to youngsters, regardless of socioeconomic status or race. Educational opportunities are most crucial since school performance has an important impact on employment prospects.

4. Access to illegitimate opportunities should be restricted.

The community cultural milieu should be reorganized to remove the supports of the illegitimate opportunity structure. Community social control should be encouraged and directed at reducing the availability of delinquent adaptations.

5. The alienation of frustrated youth should be directed into legitimate expressions of discontent.

Those youngsters who are discontented with their social position and who believe it is a consequence of the social injustices of class and race privilege may express this alienation from the social order in conventional or delinquent ways. Efforts to improve legitimate ideologies of alienation and opportunities for the collective expression of discontent should be made.

Criticisms of Social Structural Disorganization Theory. The promise of these prevention implications must be qualified because of weaknesses in the theory from which they are extracted.

Delinquent behavior is *not confined to the lower-class*--a fact which is made abundantly clear by self-report studies (e.g., Short and Nye, 1957; Nye, Short and Olson, 1958; Dentler and Monroe, 1961; Akers, 1964; Hirschi, 1969; Hindelang, 1971; Weis, 1973). Since the idea of frustrated desire is supposed to be lower-class-specific, middle-class delinquency cannot be explained by social structural disorganization theory. For example, Cohen (1955) explains middle-class delinquency by resorting to a theory of psychopathology.

Research has shown that there are class differentials in the value attached to the paramount goal of economic success. Data suggests lower-class individuals are less likely to have high economic aspirations (Hyman, 1953). The discrepancy between aspirations and achievement may not necessarily be greater for lower-class than middle-class individuals. Therefore, the frustrated desire necessary to motivate a delinquent response may not be stronger amongst lower-class youth. Besides, there is strong evidence that high aspirations do not cause delinquent behavior but, in fact, may prevent involvement in delinquency (Hirschi, 1969).

Social structural disorganization theory, as most theories of juvenile delinquency, does not address the problem of "maturational reform." Most youngsters who engage in delinquent behavior begin to cease and desist around 16 years old and eventually become law-abiding adults (Matza, 1964). If one's position in the class structure remains firmly fixed through adolescence and, usually, into adulthood, it is difficult to explain this decline in delinquency with a theory that depends upon social class as its key variable.

The empirical validity of "differential opportunity" theory (Cloward and Ohlin, 1961) is in serious doubt as a consequence of an intensive search by Short and Strodtbeck (1965) in Chicago for the three types of delinquent group adaptations specified in the theory. They did not find any pure "criminal" or "conflict" groups, and the one "retreatist" group that they discovered disintegrated shortly after discovery. It seems that a community's illegitimate opportunity structure does not affect the content of the delinquent adaptation to the extent that the theory suggests. The illegitimate structure as an alternative social control system may have been overestimated.

Assuming that social structural disorganization theory is a valid explanation of lower-class delinquency, it cannot count for the apparent differences in delinquent involvement within the lower-class, both by social area and individual. To partially remedy this theoretical problem, one might look to cultural disorganization theory (another social control modal) which focuses on the apparent ecological anchor of delinquency and upon individual differences within communities with high delinquency rates.

## B. Cultural Disorganization Theory: Culture Conflict, Cultural Transmission, Cultural Deviance

The concept of man which underlies cultural disorganization theory is *homo sanctus*--man has a social nature which borders on the holy. Man desires to conform because of his almost hypermoral nature.[15] Cultural disorganization theory proposes that juvenile delinquency is a result of the desire to conform to cultural values which are in conflict with those of the dominant order (Shaw and McKay, 1929, 1942; Sutherland and Cressey, 1970; Miller, 1957). Conformity to an unconventional sub-society or subculture, or to unconventional aspects of the dominant culture (Matza and Sykes, 1961), *means* nonconformity by conventional cultural standards but is, simply, conformity. *Homo sanctus* is incapable of deviation (cf. Hirschi, 1969: 11). In this perspective delinquent behavior is caused by proper socialization within a "deviant" social group or culture. According to these theories, juvenile delinquency is merely "marching to a different drummer."

In general, a deregulation or malintegration of cultural hegemony (viz. cultural disorganization) allows the expression of subcultural and antisocial values and behavior patterns.[16] The deregulation of cultural values, including aspirations, reflects the cultural diversity of a pluralistic society, rather than anomie within a static, consensual social order. In this theory socially structured opportunities to achieve are irrelevant because people may aspire to different cultural values. Status is achieved within a variety of sub-group opportunity structures (which may be viewed as legitimate or illegitimate, depending on your values and preferences).

Cultural disorganization theories focus upon three related issues: (1) the apparent concentration of lower-class delinquency in certain social areas, (2) the process by which high crime rates persist in certain areas, and (3) the process by which an individual comes to engage in delinquent behavior. Shaw and McKay (1929, 1942), examined the distribution of crime and delinquency by social area and over time within the city of Chicago and discovered two major regularities which inform cultural disorganization theory. First, the highest concentrations of delinquency were found in the central business-industrial-residential areas and delinquency rates increased progressively as one moved away from the center of the city. Second, certain social areas had stable high rates of delinquency over time, regardless of the different ethnic groups which moved in and out of them. Delinquency seemed to have an ecological anchor in those parts of the city where land-use policies created "slums," and "traditions of crime" were generated in these areas by immigrants, the unemployed, and the dispossessed who were forced to reside there because of low rents or discrimination.

To account for these apparent regularities, Shaw and McKay (1929, 1942) propose that "culture conflict" explains the distribution of delinquency by area and that "cultural transmission" explains the persistence of delinquency rates over time. High rate areas are characterized by culture conflict, especially the conflict of moral values concerning criminal behavior. There is a conflict between the area's "cultural norms" and the dominant culture's "crime norms" (cf. Sellin, 1938). Instead of having a singularly conventional value system, neighborhoods that have high concentrations of delinquent behavior are characterized by their conflicting conventional and criminal value systems. The relative strengths of the value systems determine the community delinquency rate. If adult criminal activity is highly organized, and anti-criminal forces are disorganized, weak or nonexistent, youngsters will be more exposed to criminal values, behavior patterns, and opportunities.[17] A youngster growing up in this type of cultural milieu lives in a disorganized culture where social controls are ill-defined or conflicting. Ultimately, he adapts to one of the systems of social control. In high delinquency rate areas, the criminal controls are stronger than conventional controls. Delinquent behavior is "principally a product of the breakdown of the machinery of spontaneous social control" (Kobrin, 1959) in transitional or interstitial (Thrasher, 1927) urban communities.

High delinquency rates persist in these communities because the tradition of crime is "transmitted" to younger generations and new residents. The cultural transmission of criminal values keeps the delinquency rate high and stable and preserves the area's cultural disorganization. The process, then, continues in a vicious circle. Unfortunately, Shaw and McKay (1929, 1942) do not specify the individual learning processes involved in cultural transmission.

Sutherland's (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970) "differential association" and "differential group organization" theories are more detailed explications of the processes of cultural transmission and culture conflict, respectively. Differential group organization is a culture conflict theory of social area variations in crime rates. Social groups are either in the business or or organized against crime. The crime rate for a particular group, whether a neighborhood, culture, or society, is an expression of the differential in group organization. This conflict of conventional and criminal values also operates in the individual learning process.

Differential association theory proposes that adult and juvenile criminal behavior is learned in interaction with others, some who encourage violation of the law and others who discourage it. An individual engages in delinquent behavior because of an excess of association with "definitions favorable to the violation of the law" over definitions unfavorable to the violation of the law. That is, he has had more contact with criminal values and behavior patterns than with anti-criminal values and behavior patterns.[18] These "differential associations" may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity. Otherwise put, an individual is most likely to engage in delinquent behavior when he has more criminal than anti-criminal associations, associates for longer periods of time with those who support criminal behavior than with those who discourage it, was exposed to criminal values and behavior patterns before anti-criminal values and behavior patterns, and is more influenced by the sources of criminal than anti-criminal values. In essence, an individual learns criminal behavior, particularly within social groups where there is culture conflict surrounding the violation of the law.

The purest cultural disorganization theory is Miller's (1957) theory of juvenile delinquency among lower-class boys. Miller takes cultural deviance theory to its logical extreme. In this view certain lower-class cultural values are not only in conflict with, but are antithetical to, dominant middle-class values. For Miller, those individuals who conform to lower-class culture, who undergo a normal socialization, almost "automatically" become deviant, particularly in relation to legal standards. In his theory members of adolescent street corner groups engage in delinquent behavior as a consequence of conforming to the alleged focal concerns or values of the alleged lower-class, such as "trouble," "toughness," "smartness," "excitement," "fate," and "autonomy." Miller views juvenile delinquency as an adolescent variant of lower-class culture or an intensified manifestation of lower-class focal concerns. In this theory delinquent behavior is not seen as hostile or rebellious behavior directed at middle-class values (cf. Cohen, 1955) but as a reflection of enculturation to a "deviant" value system. Miller's (1957) theory implies that the conflict between conventional and criminal values is unnecessary in an explanation of lower-class delinquent behavior. Lower-class youngsters who are normally socialized seem to be so encapsulated culturally that conventional values are simply different values and irrelevant in most ways to their daily existence. In short, delinquents are a normal byproduct of lower-class culture.

Implications for Prevention. Cultural disorganization theory is relatively simple compared to social structural disorganization theory. Likewise, the implications for the prevention of juvenile delinquency are easier drawn. But as Schur (1969: 188) reminds us, "diffuse, almost omnipresent, crime-encouraging definitions seem to present almost insurmountable obstacles for the would-be reformer." Most implications for delinquency prevention revolve around the strategy of community organization.

At the societal level, a restoration of cultural hegemony is suggested, particularly in the area of crime-related values, in order to control more effectively the expression and realization of antisocial subcultural values. This strategy, however, does not square with empirical and political realities in our pluralistic culture. Diversity should, in general, be respected not discouraged. Besides, the research of cultural disorganization theorists directs prevention efforts to the community, neighborhood, or social area. And cultural disorganization theory suggests two major levels of prevention effort within the community. "Culture conflict" (differential group organization) suggests that delinquent behavior can be controlled and prevented by organizing the community against crime. There should be a concerted, collective effort to neutralize the criminal value system and to promote conventional activities. If societies have the kind of crime they deserve, then so do communities. Local citizens must take a major share of the responsibility for delinquency prevention. "Cultural transmission" (differential association) suggests that another focus should be the learning process through which individuals are converted to criminal values and behavior patterns. If community organization is successful, those associations that encourage the violation of the law will be minimized and those that discourage it will be maximized. However, more specific prevention efforts are necessary at the level of the individual association process. Encouraging youngsters to participate in the life of the community and, more specifically, in efforts to ameliorate conditions that are criminogenic has the potential to decrease the number of criminal associations and the time spent with others who might be transmitting criminal values. Additionally, participation commits youngsters to a social process of conventional value reinforcement and criminal value extinction. Involvement in anti-criminal activities (e.g., a campaign to control narcotics abuse and dealing in the community) or in efforts to help others (e.g., working with children in educational or recreational contexts), engages youngsters in a process wherein they verbalize and operationalize "definitions unfavorable to the violation of the law." This may affect their behavior more than the objects of their attention.

In rehabilitative contexts this process is referred to as "retroflexive reformation" (Cressey and Volkman, 1963); one corrects oneself while correcting others. One is prevented from engaging in criminal behavior by participating in the process of ameliorating those social conditions in the community which are criminogenic. Differential association also suggests that the source of criminal values be stripped of their prestige in the community. Besides adult criminal elements, the delinquent gang should be a target of prevention efforts. The influence of older delinquent peers on children in the community can be neutralized by community cooptation of the group (Miller, 1962) or by disbanding it (Klein, 1971). In effect, this minimizes the possibility of association with a social group which supports the violation of the law by its members. It also devalues the prestige attached to gang membership in the community.

Fortunately, two major projects in delinquency prevention and control have been based on cultural disorganization theory and we may evaluate the results of these efforts. Both are "area" or "total community" projects, one based on the culture conflict and cultural transmission theories of Shaw and McKay (1929, 1942) and Sutherland (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970), and the other on the cultural deviance theory of Miller (1957). The Chicago Area Project, initiated by Shaw in 1933, is the prototype of community-anchored delinquency programs. Since delinquent behavior was viewed as "principally a product of the breakdown of the machinery of spontaneous control," a primary goal was to initiate the kinds of social change in six areas of Chicago that would generate community control mechanisms. Community organization, indigenous leadership, coordination of social and legal services, and participation by adult and juvenile residents of the communities were defined as essential to a strategy of delinquency prevention. Based on the belief that "community control" is essential, community committees were organized which selected a qualified local resident as director of the area project, with whom they attempted to coordinate and develop a variety of social services and activities. More than 20 centers serving almost 10,000 youngsters were developed. The projects encompassed recreation, clubs, hobby groups, school-community relations, discussion groups, prison release programs, counseling, referral services and so on. The Chicago Area Project represented a concerted effort to generate community solidarity and, in the process, to prevent crime and delinquency. The effect of the project on the delinquency rate in the target areas was not evaluated rigorously, but Witmer and Tufts (1954: 16) suggest that delinquency declined in three out of four communities where the Area Project had been established between 1930-1942. On the other hand, Martin (1961) points out that the evaluations did not utilize control comparisons and that the impact of community organization might be negligible in communities that exhibit much less cultural disorganization. On the whole, however, "in all probability delinquency was substantially reduced as a consequence of the effort" (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1974: 423), and there is support for the efficacy of indigenous leadership and community control in the reduction of delinquency rates.[19]

A more systematically evaluated "total community" project, based on Miller's (1957) lower-class cultural deviance theory, has generated less favorable results. However, the Midcity Youth Project was as much a gang control program as an integrated community organization and family rehabilitation program of delinquency prevention. The core of the project was intensive street work with seven gangs over a period of one to three years which produced "negligible impact" (Miller, 1962: 512) for their delinquent involvement.[20] This finding is less interesting for delinquency prevention than the apparent ability of the detached workers and the community to coopt a number of the gangs by changing them into "clubs," thereby giving them access to previously unavailable legitimate opportunities and changing their role in the community from a source of criminal values and associations to a source of conventional values and associations.

There are two less obvious implications for delinquency prevention which can be drawn from cultural disorganization theory. The first is addressed but it is not central to the analysis developed in the theory--the social, economic, and political forces which are responsible for the generation of those racial, economic and cultural ghettos wherein crime and delinquency seem to thrive. Cultural disorganization theorists are more interested in what happens in these social areas after they have been created than in their origins. That is, they do not adequately account for the generation of cultural disorganization. The favorite explanation is that "social change" creates disorganization, a concomitant breakdown in social control, and high crime rates in certain ecologically-bounded areas. This suggests that social change should be discouraged as one way of preventing delinquency. But this is an incorrect inference because the referent of "social change" is an uncontrolled economy and all of the negative consequences it carries with it. A more rationally controlled economy seems a worthwhile objective, as well as truly "social" changes directed at ending those racial and social injustices which are compounded by economic forces.

The other indirect implications for delinquency prevention is that the conflict of criminal and conventional values is not experienced only within interstices of society but is societally pervasive. Growing up in the media-oriented society of today, as compared to Chicago in the 1920's and 1930's, exposes youngsters to culture conflict on a grand scale, particularly conflict concerning law violation. "Cultural determinists" (Taft, 1942; Barron, 1954; Schur, 1969) tell us that many of our dominant cultural values are criminogenic, and this may be more true today than ever before. Many of the "subterranean values" (Matza and Sykes, 1961) to which so-called respectable people adhered to privately in the past have become part of the public domain since so many respectables have fallen from grace because of their criminal activities. "Definitions favorable to the violation of the law" may be more available now than at any other time in the history of our society. (For example, the criminal activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency and members of the White House staff under the Nixon Administration.) There is cultural disorganization on a societal level and it must be corrected if community-anchored programs are to succeed.

## Summary

The implications of cultural disorganization theory for the prevention of juvenile delinquency can be summarized as follows:

1. The key to delinquency prevention is community organization against delinquent behavior.

Community solidarity in the effort to prevention delinquency is essential. Social control is more effective when its source is the community, rather than external forces such as law enforcement.

2. Community control of prevention efforts and of other services for youth should be encouraged.

The coordination of existing social services and the development of new programs should be the responsibility primarily of community residents. Indigenous leadership is invaluable since there is a sense of responsibility to the welfare of the community and youngsters are more responsive to community leaders than to outsiders.[21]

3. The participation of youngsters, as well as adults, should be encouraged.

Increased community control should mean increased participation and power for all members of the community, particularly for the historically disenfranchised youth population. Self-help and other help by youngsters is an effective preventive which is only possible through participation.

4. Delinquent groups should be coopted or disbanded.

One of the primary sources of criminal associations--the groups of delinquent peers in the community--should be directed into conventional behavior patterns or, if this is not possible, dispersed.

5. Ties to conventional groups should be encouraged and developed.

Traditional social, religious, and fraternal groups for children should be supported actively within the community as a source of anti-criminal associations. Less traditional civil rights, political, and nationalist groups should also be utilized, especially for older youngsters who may be seeking ways to express their alienation and discontent.[22] Of course, efforts at the community and societal level should also be directed at the amelioration of those socioeconomic conditions that create the types of communities (viz. "slums") where cultural disorganization and crime are indigenous. This calls for massive changes in the political economy and in people's attitudes toward social justice and the plight of their fellows.

Criticisms of Cultural Disorganization Theory. The power of these prevention implications is threatened by most of the same weaknesses that beset social structural disorganization theory discussed earlier in this paper. Delinquent behavior is not lower-class-specific, nor is it confined to communities or areas that have predominantly lower-class populations. Cultural disorganization theory cannot account for "maturational reform." The theory does not address adequately the generation and origins of the deviant cultures or the apparent fact that high rates of official delinquency have attached to certain class and ethnic groups that also reside in clearly-defined areas in the city.

Differential association theory was formulated as a general theory of crime through the process of analytic induction. Consequently, it is so general--"criminal behavior is learned"--that it is difficult to falsify. It verges on tautology, particularly the differential group organization component,[23] and concepts are difficult to operationalize in research attempts to test the theory.[24]

Lower-class delinquents are not necessarily the socially skillful and gregarious individuals that cultural disorganization theory suggests. Some writers believe that social and interactional deficiencies may be responsible, in part, for a youth's delinquent involvement (Short and Strodtbeck, 1965).

A related problem is the finding that deviant cultures may be more of a theoretical convenience than an empirical reality. Values have been imputed to the lower-class which are antithetical to dominent cultural standards, including legal ones, but parents universally want their children to "succeed" or, at least, "turn out O.K." Data suggest (Hirschi, 1969: 130) that "there are no groups of substantial proportion in American society whose values are neutral with respect to crime. The beliefs and values that feed delinquency are not peculiar to any social class or (nondelinquent) segment of the population." This interpretation is problematic for cultural disorganization theory but supportive of the last major theory of the social control perspective--control theory.

## C. Control Theory: Containment, Socialization

Control theory is the purest type of social control theory. Unlike social structural disorganization theory, it does not have an easy answer to the Hobbesian problem of order (i.e., Why do people conform?). In fact, for control theorists the explanation of conformity is somewhat more problematic than the explanation of nonconformity.

If man by nature does not desire to conform, why does he? The concept of man which underlies this theory is tabula rasa--man is potentially moral or immoral. In this view original nature becomes human nature as a consequence of social control. The basic assumption of control theory is that "social behavior requires socialization" (Nettler, 1974: 217). Man becomes social (moral), to a greater or lesser degree, through variable socialization processes. The explanation of the resultant variability in social (moral) behavior depends on the underlying concept of the socialization process. In general, a proper socialization leads to conformity and an improper socialization leads to nonconformity. Control theory views juvenile delinquency as one of the consequences of an improper socialization. In this theory youngsters who have not developed moral bonds to the conventional order are free to engage in delinquent behavior. In social structural and cultural disorganization theories, man by nature is moral and nonconformity is a fall from grace. In control theory, nonconformity signifies that man has not yet become moral. He has not learned what he ought and, especially, ought not to do: "If we grow up 'naturally,' without cultivation, like weeds, we grow up like weeds--rank" (Nettler, 1974: 246).

The essence of control theories of juvenile delinquency is captured in Nye's (1958) observation that delinquent behavior occurs because it is simply not prevented. It is not "prevented" because of ineffective social control: socialization and/or social constraints are inadequate. Within this basic framework, control theories impute differential significance to the desired products of socialization--internal moral controls--and to the role of sanctions--external social constraints. Reiss (1951) develops this distinction in the proposition that delinquency is a "failure of personal and social controls." The internalization of norm creates personal control mechanisms which prevent the individual from "meeting needs in ways which conflict with the norms and rules of the community." These products of primary group socialization, particularly within the family, contrast with the more external social controls of the community. Among a variety of factors tested for their relation to official delinquency, the best predictors were the "measures of the adequacy of personal controls of the individual and his relation to social controls in terms of the acceptance of or submission to social control" (Reiss, 1951: 206).

Nye (1958: 5) refines this basic distinction in describing those factors which are implicated in the control of delinquent behavior: "(1) Direct control imposed from without by means of restriction and punishment, (2) internalized control exercised from within through conscience, (3) indirect control related to affectional identification with parents and other noncriminal persons, and (4) availability of alternative means to goals and values." Emerging from a focus on family relationships is the idea that indirect control prevents delinquent behavior because of the shame that it brings down upon those with whom affectional relationships have been established or upon oneself.[25] Internalized control, although apparently similar, functions because of the guilt that is created during the contemplation or after the commission of a delinquent act. Unlike most control theorists, Nye (1958) also includes a source of universal motivation: the "four wishes" of affection, recognition, security, and new experiences (Thomas, 1920). Delinquent behavior is an alternative way to satisfy the same needs that motivate other types of behavior.[26] A restriction of legitimate means to satisfy these universal needs, when linked with ineffective direct, internalized, and indirect controls, leads to delinquent behavior.

"Containment theory" (Reckless, 1956, 1961) further embellishes the distinction between personal (internalized) and social (direct) controls, Individuals are controlled through outer containment or inner containment. There is "containment through socialization to dominant values" (Horton, 1966: 44). Outer containment consists of social constraints to obey the rules and norms of one's group. Group standards condemn antisocial behavior; members are socialized, primarily within the family, to the roles, norms, and culture of the group; and there is social pressure to conform to group expectations. Social disorganization and family disorganization may render outer containment ineffectual. One consequence is delinquent behavior.

Inner containment is at the center of containment theory. It consists of the inner control or "self-control" mechanisms which are developed through socialization. A high degree of self-control is indicated by (1) a good self-concept, (2) goal-directedness, (3) realistic aspirations, (4) frustration tolerance, and (5) identification with lawfulness (cf. Nettler, 1974: 217-221). What is being controlled externally and internally are three sources of delinquent motivation--social "pressures," deviant cultural "pulls," and biopsychological "pushes." Pressures include lack of opportunity, family disorganization, poor living conditions, lower-class position and minority status. Pulls draw individuals away from the conventional order and consist of deviant associates (delinquent subculture). Pushes are deviant drives that include tension, aggression, hostility, feelings of inferiority, and organic deficiencies (Reckless, 1961: 355-356). Outer and inner containment operate as intervening variables between the pressures, pulls, and pushes and a delinquent or nondelinquent outcome. If a youngster is poor, black and lives in an area where there are delinquent gangs, the pressures and pulls may be too strong for outer containment. A youngster may refrain from delinquent behavior, however, if his inner containment is strong, as evidenced primarily by a good self-concept (cf. Reckless, Dinitz and Murray, 1956). These "good boys in high delinquency areas" have excellent self-concepts and evaluate favorably their families, schools and the law--the three institutions which control theory considers most significant in the socialization of youth.

Whereas control theories generally view delinquent behavior as an almost direct consequence of a broken moral bond to the conventional order, Sykes and Matza (1957) and Matza (1964) conceptualize it as a product of episodic releases in the moral restraints surrounding law violation. "Techniques of neutralization" are rationalizations which occur before the commission of a delinquent act which enable individuals to break the moral bind of the law (or neutralize its control) and, therefore, to break the law. They suspend the belief in the moral validity of the law and, for that matter, the conventional order. There is some bonding to the conventional order and it must be broken in some way for delinquent behavior to occur. Ironically, one of the primary sources of the motives to deviate (the techniques of neutralization) is the youngster's experience with the law and the juvenile justice system. The juvenile court "prepares the way for the delinquent's withdrawal of legitimacy ... the ideology of child welfare supports the delinquent's viewpoint in two ways. It confirms his conception of irresponsibility, and it feeds his sense of injustice. Both support the processes by which the moral bind of law is neutralized. Both facilitate the draft into delinquency" (Matza, 1964: 97-98). The "drifting" delinquent can delegitimate the law by verbalizing what has been expressed to him by adults, teachers, police, probation officers, juvenile court judges, and so on: "I am not responsible because I come from a broken home, and besides, I'm only a kid;" "It didn't hurt anyone;" "The guy deserved it because he always rips off the public anyway;" "Politicians and cops are on the take more than me;" "I was helping a friend who was in big trouble." These verbal responses are catalogued as: (1) denying responsibility; (2) denying injury; (3) denying the victim; (4) condemning the condemners; and (5) appealing to higher loyalties. These justifications allow the youngster to reduce the expected negative reaction to a contemplated delinquent act. Delinquent behavior is "based on what is essentially an unrecognized extension of defenses to crimes, in the form of justifications for deviance that are seen as valid by the delinquent but not by the legal system or the society at large" (Sykes and Matza, 1957: 666). This view suggests that the moral obstacles to crime are removed as a consequence of some of the irrational features of the law as it applies to juveniles, and the individual is ready to engage in delinquent behavior without guilt.

Matza (1964: 182) agrees with some critics of control theory that delinquency cannot be explained simply be an absence of controls. Something else must provide a "will to delinquency." This something else is the feeling of desperation which is attached to the biography of many lower-class, urban males. Delinquent behavior relieves the desperation because the perpetrator is causing things to happen, rather than experiencing himself in the usual way "as effect." In short, in addition to neutralizing the "internal and external demands for conformity" (Sykes and Matza, 1957: 666), the potential delinquent must be moved from the state of readiness-to-act to infraction.

Control theory proposes that neutralization and will to delinquency are unnecessary because "many persons do not have an attitude of respect toward the rules of society; many persons feel no moral obligation to conform " (Hirschi, 1969: 25). Because of variable socialization, some youngsters have weak beliefs in the moral validity of the law and this increases the probability of delinquent behavior. Besides, control theory proposes that if a youngster has established a moral bond to the conventional order, he will be less able to use techniques of neutralization. In short, this version of control theory adheres strictly to the propositions that delinquent behavior occurs when an individual's bond to society is weak or broken.

Hirschi's (1969) control theory is more complete than others because it specifies theoretically and empirically the elements of the bond to society (attachment, commitment, involvement, belief) and the significant units of control (family, school, law).[27] A strong moral bond consists of attachment to others, commitment to conventional lines of action, involvement in conventional activities, and belief in the moral order and law. Delinquent behavior becomes possible when there is inadequate attachment, particularly to parents and school; inadequate commitment, particularly to educational and occupational success; and inadequate belief, particularly in the legitimacy and moral validity of the law.[28] The chain of causation moves from attachment to parents, through commitment to the educational and occupation aspirations that the school attempts to articulate with adult status, to belief that the rules of society deserve to be adhered to (cf. Hirschi, 1969: 198-200).

The theory asserts that youngsters who do not develop a bond to the conventional order because of incomplete socialization feel no moral obligation to conform. For Hirschi, the delinquent is the faulty or unfinished product of socialization--he is an incomplete social being. The social process of making him moral has been interrupted by uncaring parents, poor school performance, visions of occupational failure, delinquent associates, and a questionably legitimate legal system. An unattached, uncommitted, and disbelieving youngster is the product of ineffective social control (socialization). He is free to engage in delinquent behavior; special delinquent motivation is unnecessary to account for the behavior of a not quite social or not quite moral individual. It is to be expected.

Implications for Prevention. Control theory suggests that delinquent behavior can be prevented by increasing the effectiveness of those institutions which are primarily responsible for the socialization and control of youth. Implications for the prevention of juvenile delinquency revolve around the strategy of institutional change.

If delinquent behavior is a consequence of incomplete socialization and inadequate social constraints, the effectiveness of three particularly salient institutions--the family, the school, and the law--must be improved.[29] Improving these social institutions will create more adequate outer (external, social, direct) and inner (internal, personal, internalized) controls. The family is, perhaps, most important since it is "without doubt the most effective unit of social control that exists" (Landis, 1938: 165). The family is viewed as the first line of defense against delinquency because it exerts direct control through its supervision of the activities and behavior of children. Hirschi (1969) reports that this type of external control prevents the emergence of delinquent behavior. Equally important is the family's role in developing a youngster's self-control, which is anchored in a positive self-concept (Reckless, 1961). Efforts to improve the control effectiveness of the family should be directed at enhancing its direct control function and its ability to develop self-control among children. The juvenile court attempts to accomplish these ends by working with families who come to the attention of the court because of the apparent delinquent status of their children. This is primarily a control strategy, and it merges with correctional techniques.

A truly preventive strategy would focus either on "families with problems" or "problems with families." The first phrase suggests early identification and services provided in the community, independent of the juvenile justice system. The second phrase suggests a critical analysis of the role of the family in our society, the transformation of the nuclear family, and the development of more viable living arrangements. However, the latter would be an improper inference from control theory because control theory assumes a static, consensual order which, if functioning properly, effectively socializes and controls its members. Control theorists rarely acknowledge that there may be disorder within, and of the conventional order. Likewise, control theory examines family disorganization, without questioning the validity of the family as a social institution. Control theory, instead, suggests that the family be improved as one of the crucial socialization institutions which constitute the conventional order. Early identification and prevention services in the community are prevention efforts directed at youngsters who, apparently, are potentially delinquent. These programs rely on prediction devices which typically are loaded with family variables. Potential delinquents are predicted from a population of children who are relatively young and, then, they are placed in a program designed to prevent their delinquent tendencies from ripening into full-blown delinquent behavior.

The two best-known early identification and service projects are the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study (Powers and Witmer, 1951) and the New York City Youth Board Study (Craig and Glick, 1963; Craig, 1965). In the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study (Powers and Witmer, 1951), the prototype for early identification and service projects, children between six and eleven years old were referred by teachers and police to a committee which predicted whether they were predelinquents or not. The prognoses were made on the basis of reports and evaluations submitted by teachers and police, a home visit by a staff psychologist, and subjective clinical evaluations. After matching youngsters within the groups of predelinquents and nondelinquents, they were randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. The treatment consisted of "intensive personal counseling" over an average of five years. Evaluations led to the conclusion that "the special work of the counselors was no more effective than the usual forces in the community in preventing boys from committing delinquent acts" (Powers and Witmer, 1951: 337).

The New York City Youth Board Study (Craig and Glock, 1963; Craig, 1965) is more to the point because an attempt was made to predict delinquency among 223 first grade boys by using Glueck's (1960) family background prediction scale, a five-factor scale including discipline of boy by father, supervision of boy by mother, affection of father for son, affection of mother for son, and cohesiveness of family. A number of psychiatric, educational and social work services were provided to the predelinquents with little positive effect (Toby, 1965). After ten years the youngsters who came from families with problems, the predelinquents, and who were being "corrected" were just as delinquent as the control group.

A couple of atypical early identification and service programs focus on the family, rather than the individual as the target of preventive efforts. One such program in the "revitalization of parent-child relations" was organized at the Henry Street Settlement House in New York City (Tefferteller, 1959). Parents with eight- to 13-year-old predelinquents, as evidenced by their membership in street-corner groups, were encouraged to strengthen their authority and control over their children, as well as to be more tolerant of certain behavior. Five groups of parents were formed in which discussions concerning their children, misbehavior, and ways to keep them out of trouble with the law were held. Collectively, they became more effective in controlling the potentially delinquent behavior of their children. This program suggests that strengthening the family's direct control over their children and establishing relationships with neighbors who may have the same problems may be an effective way to prevent delinquency. Unfortunately, there is no systematic evaluation of the program; only the statements and opinions of those involved in it are available.

Another family-centered program in Washington, D.C. provided social casework services to a group of predicted delinquents (or predelinquents) and their parents (Tait and Hodges, 1962). An initial report provided by project members suggested positive results, but a more rigorous evaluation using police and court records indicated no differences between treatment and control groups.

Overall, these early identification and service programs suggest that prevention efforts which focus on only one member of a family--the identified predelinquent--are not very successful. If family dynamics are etiologically significant in the generation of delinquent behavior, the entire family should be the target of prevention efforts. We have seen that a family's direct control can be enhanced by organizing parents in supportive interaction networks. A family's ability to develop self-control in a child can be enhanced by teaching parents more effective child-rearing techniques. This is not easily accomplished, since no one likes to be told directly how to raise their children. However, family planning, parent education,[30] child development educational and day care centers, family counseling and therapy, and even the establishment of therapeutic communities for some families (Tait and Hodges, 1962) may indirectly affect child-rearing practices, particularly those which affect the self-concept of the child (cf. Rodman and Grams, 1967). On the other hand, there is an important sense in which exercising direct control and developing self-control cannot be separated conceptually or operationally. Anything that improves the family as an institution of socialization and control will affect both the outer and inner containment of delinquent behavior.

The school is also important in a delinquency prevention strategy. Poor academic performance, substandard achievement, negative feelings toward teachers and the school, low self-esteem in the face of failure, and depressed educational aspirations indicate a lack of attachment and commitment to an important unit of socialization and control. This apparently cumulative cycle of educational failure cannot be traced only to inherent differences in ability because there is too much evidence which suggests that the inadequacies of the public education system are primarily responsible for these failures. Attachment and commitment to education can only become possible for more youngsters through changes in the prevailing conceptions and organization of the educational system. Schools should organize their programs in order that more children can develop a bond to conventional lines of action that are relevant to adult roles in society.

Focus on the institutional change of the educational system makes more sense in light of the failures of remedial programs designed to correct individuals who have educational and behavioral problems. An experimental educational program in Washington, D.C. paid 50 youngsters up to $40 a week to attend an educational center where they were to study in order to pass high school equivalency examinations. Apparently, there was no relationship between participation in the program and passing the examinations. Only 42 of 167 participants completed the program and only 13 passed the equivalency tests (Jeffery and Jeffery, 1969). The results at Girls Vocational High (Meyer, Borgatta, and Jones, 1965) are equally discouraging. Girls with personal and emotional problems, who were judged as potentially delinquent by their teachers, were provided with social casework and group therapy by an agency which specialized in working with adolescent girls. From the population of nominees, 189 were involved in the program. Evaluation of school and social behavior change on a number of dimensions revealed that the girls who participated in the program differed very little, if at all, from the control group.[31] There was one encouraging result--the program girls were less truant.

We do not suggest that remedial education, social casework, group therapy, or counseling should be discouraged or, perhaps, terminated as ways to help youngsters who have educational problems. What is suggested, however, is that it is necessary to redefine the problem and, therefore, the implied solutions. "Problems of adjustment" to school are due, in great part, to problems with education, as well as to individual educational problems. An effective strategy of delinquency prevention should include solutions to the problems with education.

> Proposals for preventing, reducing, and controlling delinquency cannot refer only to programs that relate directly to control problems in the schools, but must reach deeply to the underlying and core conditions that help produce educational failure, perceived irrelevancy, lack of commitment, and exclusion--and, therefore, delinquency (Schafer and Polk, 1957: 58).

A number of recommendations for institutional change flow from the position that the current educational system helps produce delinquency. They have been specified in great detail by Schafer and Polk (1967: 258-304), and they will be summarized here. First, school districts should increase the educational success changes of high delinquency-risk populations in order to subvert the typically negative consequences of educational failure. This can be accomplished by getting teachers to believe that all students can and should be educated; expanding pre-school education programs, such as Head Start programs; developing curricula and educational material that are relevant to the life experiences and needs of the students; developing teaching methods appropriate to the student population; utilizing flexible grouping and individualized curriculum, rather than "tracking" students; reeducating teachers on a continual basis; increasing rewards for teaching in low-income schools in order to upgrade the teaching staff; and creating class and racial diversity through rezoning, bussing, open enrollment, educational parks, pairing schools, and combatting racism.

Second, school districts should make the school curriculum more relevant to the occupational market, especially for students who are not college-bound, in order to decrease the role of perceived irrelevancy in the generation of delinquent behavior. This can be accomplished by developing alternative career routes, especially those subprofessional jobs in the ever-expanding human service field; creating job placement and follow-up offices in high schools which find jobs for graduates and monitor their performance after employment; and increasing the accessibility to higher education through junior college expansion and expanded scholarship, aid, and loan programs.

Third, school districts should develop means for generating and sustaining the commitment of youth to the education system and to community standards of behavior. This can be accomplished by including youngsters in educational planning and decision-making processes wherever possible; developing viable student political organizations which can exercise some authority in the school. Schools should encourage participation in extracurricular activities and make them more available to more students. Students should be involved in the instructional process as tutors, aides, and special instructors in areas where they are particularly knowledgeable.

Fourth, school districts should develop means for recapturing, re-equipping, recommitting, and reintegrating students who are not performing at acceptable levels. This can be accomplished by eliminating responses which exclude less-than-model students and developing more positive kinds of responses. Examples of positive approaches to student learning difficulties include special programs and classes and coordinated but decentralized special services to make services more accessible to the student.

Fifth, school districts should try to bring about closer cooperation and coordination among the school, families, and agencies in the community. This can be accomplished by bringing parents into the educational process; establishing school-community advisory panels consisting of parents and students who are elected by the community; and encouraging the schools to be "community schools" or centers of all kinds of activities, day and night, throughout the year.

Sixth, school districts should be concerned with quality control in education and, seventh, with ways of developing and supporting educational innovation. Both of these efforts should help correct the rigidity, inflexibility, and lag in education that may contribute to the production of delinquent behavior.

The law is also important in a delinquency prevention strategy, but in a different way than the family and school. The "belief" in the legitimacy and moral validity of the law must be strengthened, particularly among doubters, non-believers, and the disenfranchised. Formal courses in school on "the law" is one way to accomplish this. Another is to upgrade criminal justice administration, strip it of hypocrisy, eliminate its often arbitrary and discriminatory decisions, and to make it truly a system of justice. Control theory, however, suggests more specific implications for bolstering belief in the legal system.

If "neutralizations" are relevant in the causal dynamics that generate delinquent behavior, as Sykes and Matza (1964) tell us they are, the sources of the neutralizations must, in turn, be neutralized. Specifically, there should be an institutional overhaul of the juvenile justice system, particularly the juvenile court, in order to eliminate the sense of injustice and the defenses to delinquent behavior that it creates for those who come into contact with it. The juvenile court should not function as a court wherein juvenile criminals are treated as irresponsible and dependent. The jurisdiction of the juvenile court (and juvenile justice system for that matter) should be restricted to juveniles who commit crimes,[32] and those juvenile criminals who come before it should be accorded the same legal and civil responsibilities and rights as adult criminals. These types of changes should make neutralizations less available to youngsters, which in effect, prevents them from breaking the moral bond of the law and becoming free to commit delinquent acts. Family problems (incorrigibility), school problems (truancy), and welfare problems (dependency-neglect) should be handled by the appropriate agencies outside of the juvenile justice system (cf. Schur, 1973). Of course, making the juvenile court more like adult courts is not going to solve all of the problems which surround the development of a strong belief in the law. In fact, one should expect more problems initially, but ultimately, one should expect a more just and respected juvenile justice system and, therefore, a stronger belief in its legitimacy and moral validity.

## Summary

The implications of control theory for the prevention of juvenile delinquency can be summarized as follows:

1. The key to delinquency prevention is institutional change of those institutions which are primarily responsible for the socialization and control of youth--the family, the school, and the law.

The effectiveness of these institutions must be improved. Doing so will create more adequate outer and inner containment of potentially antisocial behavior.

2. Efforts to improve the control effectiveness of the family should be directed at enhancing its direct control function and its ability to develop self-control among children.

The family, rather than the predelinquent, should be the target of corrective efforts which rely on early identification and prediction. A family's direct control can be enhanced by organizing parents in supportive interaction networks. A family's ability to develop self-control in a child can be enhanced through more effective child-rearing practices, particularly those which affect the child's self-concept.

3. Attachment to the school and commitment to education must be developed and sustained for as many students in as many ways as possible.

Schools should organize their programs in order to improve the possibility of educational success, the relevance of curriculum to occupational career, the commitment of youth to education and to community standards of behavior, and the means of integrating students into curricular and extracurricular activities.

4. The juvenile court should be desocialized, or reorganized as a criminal court for juveniles, in order to strengthen belief in the law.

School classes on the criminal justice system may improve respect for the law, but fundamental changes in the philosophy, organization, and operation of the juvenile court are necessary to suspend the sense of injustice and the claim of irresponsibility which buttress the rationalizations that neutralize belief in the moral bind of the law and of the conventional order.

5. Enhancing the self-concept of youngsters should be part of all institutional changes directed at delinquency prevention.

Good self-concepts are essential to effective self-control. Wherever possible, positive feedback should be encouraged and undue negative feedback discouraged in the socialization of youngsters whether in the family, school, or juvenile justice system.

In summary, juvenile delinquency can be prevented by improving the effectiveness of those institutions which are primarily responsible for the socialization and control of youth--the family, the school, and the law. In short, establish more effective institutional social control.

Criticisms of Control Theory. The validity of these prevention implications is endangered by many of the problems that plague social structural disorganization theory and cultural disorganization theory. Control theory is not bothered by the fact that delinquent behavior is not lower-class-specific because it is not a class-specific theoretical perspective. An incomplete socialization, leading to a weak or broken bond to the conventional order, knows no class lines. Most control theories also have trouble with "maturational reform" because many aspects of outer and inner containment remain constant while there is a decline in delinquent involvement.

There is a danger of tautology in the concept of inner containment (or internalized, personal, or self control). If controls are internalized--for example, the "internalization of norms"--it is almost impossible to measure the internalization independent of the behavior that is supposed to be controlled. It cannot be shown to be false because empirical observations cannot be made of the independent and dependent variables. In effect, one has to infer inadequate inner containment (or poor self-concept, weak personal control, inadequate internalized control) from the observation of delinquent behavior.

If delinquent behavior is a byproduct of incomplete socialization, a relatively complete explanation of how people are socialized seems essential. Sociological versions of control theory do not do so; some psychological theories are more comprehensive in this regard (cf. Nettler, 1974: 221-246). Control theory tends to disregard those factors, such as mobility, cultural diversity, and social change, which might interrupt the process of making an individual moral.

The influence of informal group processes falls outside of the purview of control theory, probably because of its institutional focus. The importance of friends and companions is underestimated or disregarded (Hindelang, 1973: 487). Data indicate that peer attachments are directly related to delinquent behavior, a finding which is contrary to control theory. "Notions about the contribution delinquent activities make to the person's self-concept or self-esteem would also seem to be necessary" (Hirschi, 1969: 230).

For control theory to work, it must assume a consensual order, as does social structural disorganization theory. Both must cope with the pluralism and cultural diversity upon which cultural disorganization theory rests. And, after all, conventional society may have values that are criminogenic or criminal in and of themselves (cf. Schur, 1969).

Finally, many critics have pointed to the apparent absence of motivation to deviate as a weakness of the theory. "Absence of controls" is considered an incomplete explanation, unless there is an impetus to deviate (Cohen and Short, 1961). Matza (1964: 182) concurs with the criticism and provides a "will to delinquency" as the driving force.[33]

## Conclusion

The social control perspective of juvenile delinquency points to prevention strategies which can be characterized as liberal reform efforts. The conventional order is taken as a given, and programs to prevent delinquent behavior attempt to ameliorate problems within the conventional order. The implications for delinquency prevention of these three theories within the social control perspective revolve around the general strategies of equalizing opportunity, community organization, and institutional change, respectively. Social structural disorganization theory suggests "structural" changes to restore social equilibrium. Cultural disorganization theory suggests "cultural" changes to restore cultural hegemony. And control theory suggests "institutional" changes to restore infrastructural organization.

A final comment seems necessary. There is evidence elsewhere which suggests that criminologists should concentrate less on the juvenile delinquency problem and its prevention and more on the problems that the social structure, culture, and institutions create for juveniles and on the issue of social justice for juveniles (juvenile injustice prevention perhaps?). Ultimately, we may be deluding ourselves in thinking that something can be done to prevent delinquency within the current social order.

> If the roots of crime lie far back in the foundations of our social order, it may be that only a radical change can bring any large measure of cure. Less unjust social and economic conditions may be the only way out, and until a better social order exists, crime will probably flourish and society continue to pay the price (Healy, Bronner, and Shimberg, 1935: 222).

Footnotes:

[1] This restriction, of course, excludes the "labeling perspective" because it does not attempt to, nor can it, explain delinquent behavior. At best, it is a theory of official delinquency (cf. Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1951; Gibbs, 1966).

[2] Hirschi (1969) identifies them as "strain," "control," and "cultural deviance" theories.

[3] After examining data from 55 societies, Rootman (1973) concludes that Durkheim's theory can be distilled even further. He found that integration and regulation are not identical conditions, that the former is more important in causing suicide, and that Durkheim's theory can be summarized as "The less and more integrated a society, group, or social condition is, the higher its suicide rate."

[4] "Disorganization" is used here to mean "deregulation" and "malintegration." It is an inclusive term for Durkheim's (1897) notions of anomie and egoism and follows closely Thomas and Znaniecki's (1920) definition of disorganization: a "decrease of the influence of existing social rules of behavior upon individual members of the group."

[5] See Hirschi's (1969: 3-15) excellent discussion of the three theoretical perspectives discussed here.

[6] Hirschi (1969) suggests that structural disorganization theorists conceive of man as social or moral; therefore, since man is moral, he wants to conform. This may be an oversimplification and misinterpretation.

[7] It could also be relieved by devaluing or repudiating the end, but these are "retreatist" and "rebellious" adaptations, rather than an "innovative" or criminal one.

[8] This is the link between "social structural" and "cultural" disorganization theories. The same disorganization (deregulation and malintegration) which is responsible for crime is also responsible for the creation of alternative, substitute opportunity structures and subcultures.

[9] More specifically, Cohen (1955) describes it as a "working class" and Cloward and Ohlin (1961) as a "lower class" phenomenon.

[10] However, "cultural determinists (Taft, 1942; Barron, 1954; Schur, 1969) would focus on cultural values because they conceptualize many of them in our culture as criminogenic. Of course, social structural disorganization theorists agree that some of our most cherished values are criminogenic but only as people strive for them and relive them within a social structural context that affects the magnitude of their criminogenic power.

[11] An inverse relation between class and delinquent behavior is created or assumed.

[12] Some conditions are viewed as justly interfering with achievement. For example, differences in "ability" are recognized as legitimate causes of success or failure. See Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1961) concerning the role of differentials in intelligence in the generation of delinquent behavior.

[13] Or as former President Johnson put it: "Warring on poverty, inadequate housing, and unemployment is warring crime. A civil rights law is a law against crime. Money for schools is money against crime. Medical, psychiatric, and family counseling services are services against crime. More broadly and most importantly, every effort to improve life in America's 'inner cities' is an effort against crime" (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967: 6).

[14] Actually, this is an excellent example of the interplay of policy and theory, because one of the authors was actively involved in the formulation and activities of the project.

[15] Hirschi (1969: 12) suggests that in some cultural disorganization theories "the criminal ends up just a little more moral than the law-abiding citizen because his actions are based on considerations of social solidarity rather than personal achievement."

[16] Cultural disorganization theory disregards social structure as a source of disorganization, perhaps because it is unnecessary within a model of radical cultural pluralism. "Different strokes for different folks" says it all.

[17] Again, this theory is the source of Cloward and Ohlin's (1961) concept of the illegitimate opportunity structure.

[18] Neutral associations and cultural values have no effect, and most are neutral in that they neither encourage nor discourage criminal behavior.

[19] "Even in the most unlikely localities capable persons of good will have responded to the challenge of responsibility and have, with help and guidance, operated neighborhood programs. On the whole these organizations have exhibited vitality and stability and have come to represent centers of local opinion regarding issues which concern the welfare of the young" (Kobrin, 1959).

[20] Unfortunately, the impact of the community and family components on delinquency in the community was not assessed, primarily because they were not carried out sufficiently to evaluate rigorously.

[21] This might be extended to include community control of local schools, police, and other institutions which serve juveniles in the community.

[22] These types of groups may provide a conventional context for the expression of lower-class "focal concerns" (Miller, 1957). For example, a youngster may be tough, smart, autonomous, and involved in exciting activity by being a member of a group of community political activists.

[23] To assert that a group has a high crime rate because it is in the business of crime, or that another group has a low crime rate because it is organized against criminal involvement, is a circular nonexplanation.

[24] See Cressey (1960) for a discussion of and response to criticisms of differential association theory.

[25] Or "You don't want to hurt the ones you love."

[26] In a sense, human nature is recast by Thomas to be a four-wish fulfilling one--and behavior is merely an expression of this nature.

[27] Others might address one of the elements of the bond; for example, Toby (1957) and Briar and Piliavin (1965) focus on commitment. Or a theory might be constructed around one of the units of control; for example, Nye (1958) focused on the family, while Matza (1964) focused on the law.

[28] It was discovered that involvement is not a significant element in the bond.

[29] The "social pressures" in containment theory (Reckless, 1961) are identical to the sources of frustration in social structural disorganization theory; therefore, prevention implications are the same. The "pulls" are the attractions of deviant cultures in cultural disorganization theory; again, prevention implications are identical. The implications of "pushes" are best left to biologists and psychologists.

[30] It has been suggested (Rodman and Grams, 1967: 216) that a series of public affairs "parent-education-television commercials" be aired regularly to improve child-rearing practices.

[31] "On these tests no strong indications of effect are found and the conclusion must be stated in the negative when it is asked whether social work intervention with potential problem high school girls was in this instance effective" (Meyer, Borgatta, and Jones, 1965: 180).

[32] "Crimes" that are crimes for adults, nor "status offense" types of illegal acts.

[33] In Hirschi's (1969) control theory the motivation to deviate is unnecessary; youngsters engage in delinquent behavior because they have not learned not to.

References:

1. Akers, Ronald L. "Socio-Economic Status and Delinquent Behavior: A Retest." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1 (January): 38-46 1964.

2. Angel, Shlomo. Discouraging Crime through City Planning. Berkeley: Institute of Urban and Regional Development, 1968.

3. Aschaffenburg, Gustav. Crime and Its Repression. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1913.

4. Barron, Milton L. The Juvenile in Delinquent Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954.

5. Beccaria, Cesare. An Essay of Crimes and Punishments. London: Alanon, 1967.

6. Becker, Howard S. Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press, 1963.

7. Bentham, Jeremy. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. London: Pickering, 1823.

8. Bibb, Marylyn. "Gang-Related Services of Mobilization for Youth," in Malcolm W. Klein (ed), Juvenile Gangs in Context. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

9. Briar, Scott and Piliavin, Irving. "Delinquency, Situational Inducements and Commitment to Conformity," Social Problems, 13:35-45, 1965.

10. Cassell, Frank H. "New Dimensions in Employment Services for Youth," Employment Service Review, May: 1-6, 1966.

11. Census Bureau. Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

12. Cicousel, Aaron V. The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

13. Clark, John P. and Eugene P. Wenninger. "Socio-Economic Class and Areas or Correlates of Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles," American Sociological Review, 26 (December): 826-834, 1962.

14. Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

15. Cohen, Albert. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

16. Cohen, Albert K. and Short, James F., Jr. "Research in Delinquent Subcultures," Journal of Social Issues, 14 (3): 20-37, 1958.

17. Cohen, Albert K. and Short, James F. "Juvenile Delinquency," in Robert K. Merton and Robert A. Nisbet (eds.), Contemporary Social Problems. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1961.

18. Coleman, James S. et al, Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

19. Craig, Maude M. "Application of the Glueck Social Prediction Table on an Ethnic Basis," Crime and Delinquency, 11: 175-185, 1965.

20. Craig, Maude M. and Glick, Selma J. "Ten Year's Experience With the Glueck Social Prediction Table," Crime and Delinquency, 9 (July): 249-261, 1963.

21. Cressey, Donald R. "Epidemiology and Individual Conduct," Pacific Sociological Review, 3:37-54, 1960.

22. Dentler, Robert A. and Monroe, Lawrence J. "Social Correlates of Early Adolescent Theft," American Sociological Review, 26 (October): 733-743, 1961.

23. Durkheim, Emile. Suicide. New York: The Free Press, 1897, 1951.

24. Durkheim, Emile. Rules of Sociological Method (8th Edition). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950.

25. Durkheim, Emile. Moral Education. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

26. Emerson, Robert M. Judging Delinquents: Context and Process in Juvenile Court. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

27. Empey, LaMar T. and Rabow, Jerome. "The Provo Experiment in Delinquent Rehabilitation," American Sociological Review 26 (October): 679-696, 1961.

28. Gibbs, Jack P. "Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and the New," Pacific Sociological Review, 9 (Spring): 9-14, 1966.

29. Gleuck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor. Predicting Delinquency and Crime. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

30. Goldman, Nathan. "The Differential Selection of Juvenile Offenders for Court Appearance," in William J. Chambliss (ed.), Crime and the Legal Process, 264-290. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

31. Hackler, James C. "Boys, Blisters, and Behavior--The Impact of a Work Program in an Urban Central Area," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 3 (July): 155-164, 1966.

32. Haskell, Martin R. and Yablonsky, Lewis. Juvenile Delinquency. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1974.

33. Healy, William; Bronner, Augusta; and Shimberg, Myra. "The Close of Another Chapter in Criminology," Mental Hygiene, 19: 208-222, 1935.

34. Hindelang, Michael J. "Age, Sex, and the Versatility of Delinquent Involvements," Social Problems, 18, 4 (Spring): 522-535, 1971.

35. Hindelang, Michael J. "Causes of Delinquency: A Partial Replication and Extension," Social Problems, 20, 4: 471-487, 1973.

36. Hirschi, Travis. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

37. Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. Oxford, England: Blackwell, 1957.

38. Horton, John. "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems," American Journal of Sociology, (May): 701-713, 1966.

39. Hyman, Herbert H. "The Value Systems of Different Classes" in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class, Status and Power, 426-442. New York: The Free Press, 1953.

40. Jeffrey, C. Ray. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1971.

41. Jeffrey, C. Ray and Jeffrey, I. A. "Dropouts and Delinquency: An Experimental Program in Behavior Change," Education and Urban Society, 1: 325-336, 1969.

42. Klein, Malcolm. Street Gangs and Street Workers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

43. Kobrin, Solomon. "The Chicago Area Project--A 25-Year Assessment," The Annals, 322 (March: 19-29, 1959.

44. Landis, Paul H. Social Control. New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1939.

45. Lejins, Peter. "The Field of Prevention," in William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford (eds.), Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice, 1-21. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

46. Lemert, Edwin M. Social Pathology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

47. Lohman, Joseph D. "Foreword," in William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford (eds.), Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice, xiii-xv. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

48. Martin, John. "Three Approaches to Delinquency Prevention: A Critique," Crime and Delinquency 7 (January): 16-24, 1961.

49. Matza, David. Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

50. Matza, David and Sykes, Gresham M. "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values," American Sociological Review, 26: 712-719, 1961.

51. McPherson, James A. "The Blackstone Rangers," in Jack D. Douglas (ed.), Observations of Deviance, 170-201. New York: Random House, 1970.

52. Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomie," American Sociological Review, 3 (October): 672-682, 1937.

53. Meyer, Henry I.; Borgatta, Edgar F; and Jones, Wyatt C. Girls at Vocational High. New York: Russell-Sage, 1965.

54. Miller, Walter B. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, 14 (3): 5-19, 1958.

55. Miller, Walter B. "The Impact of a 'Total Community' Delinquency Control Project," Social Problems, 10, 1 (Fall): 168-191, 1962.

56. Nettler, Gwynn. Explaining Crime. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

57. Newman, Oscar. Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

58. Nye, F. Ivan. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

59. Nye, F. Ivan and Short, James F., Jr. "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, 22 (June): 326-331, 1957.

60. Nye, F. Ivan; Short, James F., Jr.; and Olson, Virgil J. "Socio-Economic Status in Delinquent Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 63 (January): 381-389, 1958.

61. Ohlin, Lloyd and Cloward, Richard. "The Prevention of Delinquent Subcultures," in Martin S. Weinburg and Earl Rubington (eds.), The Solution of Social Problems, 1973.

62. Piliavin, Irving and Briar, Scott. "Police Encounters With Juveniles," *American Journal of Sociology*, 70 (September): 206-214, 1964.

63. Platt, Anthony. *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

64. Powers, Edwin and Witmer, Helen. *An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

65. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

66. Reckless, Walter. *The Crime Problem*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

67. Reckless, Walter C.; Divitz, Simon; and Murray, Ellen. "Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," *American Sociological Review*, 21: 744-746, 1956.

68. Reiss, Albert J. "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls," *American Sociological Review*, 16: 196-207, 1951.

69. Robin, Gerald R. "Anti-Poverty Programs and Delinquency," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 60: 323-31, 1969.

70. Rodman, Hyman and Grams, Paul. "Juvenile Delinquency and the Family: A Review and Discussion," in President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, 188-221. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

71. Rootman, Irving. "A Cross-Cultural Note on Durkheim's Theory of Suicide," *Life-Threatening Behavior*, 3 (2): 83-94, 1973.

72. Schafer, Walter E. and Polk, Kenneth. "Delinquency and the Schools," in President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, 222-277. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

73. Schur, Edwin M. *Our Criminal Society*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

74. Schur, Edwin M. Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Significance. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

75. Schur, Edwin M. Radical Nonintervention. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

76. Sellin, Thorsten. Culture Conflict and Crime. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1938.

77. Sellin, Thorsten and Wolfgang, Marvin E. The Measurement of Delinquency. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

78. Shaw, Clifford R. Delinquency Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

79. Shaw, Clifford and McKay, Henry D. Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

80. Short, James F. "Youth, Gangs, and Society: Micro and Macrosociological Processes," The Sociological Quarterly, 15 (Winter): 3-19, 1974.

81. Short, James F., Jr. and Nye, F. Ivan. "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior," Social Problems, 5 (Winter): 207-213, 1957.

82. Short, James F., Jr. and Strodtbeck, Fred L. Group Processes and Gang Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

83. Sussman, Frederick B. Law of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Oceana, 1959.

84. Sutherland, Edwin H. and Cressey, Donald R. Principles of Criminology. New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1970.

85. Sykes, Gresham M. and Matza, David. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 22 (December): 664-670, 1957.

86. Taft, Donald R. Criminology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1942.

87. Tait, C. Downing and Hodges, Emory F. Delinquents, Their Families, and the Community. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas, 1962.

88. Tappan, Paul. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949.

89. Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

90. Tefferteller, Ruth S. "Delinquency Prevention Through Revitalizing Parent-Child Relations," The Annals, 322: 69-78, 1959.

91. Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, Florian. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1920.

92. Thrasher, Frederic M. The Gang. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

93. Toby, Jackson. "Social Disorganization and Strife in Conformity: Complementary Factors in the Predatory Behavior of Hoodlums," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 48: 12-17.

94. Toby, Jackson. "Early Identification and Intensive Treatment of Predelinquents: A Negative View," Social Work, 6, 3: 3-13, 1965.

95. United Nations Consultative Group. Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. Geneva: United Nations Publication, 1968.

96. Viano, Emilio and Drapkin, Israel (eds.). Victimology. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath, 1973.

97. Volkman, Rita and Cressey, Donald R. "Differential Association and the Rehabilitation of Drug Addicts," American Journal of Sociology, 69: 129-142, 1963.

98. Weis, Joseph G. Delinquency Among the Well to Do, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

99. Witmer, H. C. and Tufts, E. The Effectiveness of Delinquency Prevention Programs. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, H.E.W., 1954.

100. Zimring, Franklin. Perspectives on Deterrence. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Public Health Service, 1971.

101. Zimring, Franklin E. and Hawkins, Gordon. Deterrence: The Legal Threat in Crime Control. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

## II - COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SUBCULTURAL THEORIES OF DELINQUENCY--Delinquency as a Subculture

This paper will focus on the factors and assumptions of four subcultural theories of delinquency. In discussing the theories of Cohen (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960), Miller (1970), and Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967), we use the term delinquent culture to mean one "in which certain forms of delinquent activity are essential requirements for the performance of the dominant roles supported by the subculture" (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960:7).

In describing the general nature of the four subcultural theories, we have chosen to focus on assumptions and factors that have value for distinguishing these theories from other types of criminological theories. Assumptions and factors, indicating that crime is a learned phenomenon, or prevalent in urban settings, for example, are of little use because they characterize a wide variety of criminological theories and theories of deviance.

Similarly, it is not possible to point to any single assumption and state that this assumption characterizes subcultural theories to the exclusion of other perspectives; rather we have attempted to delineate and document a cluster of assumptions which apply specifically to the four subcultural theories under discussion.

1. Subcultural theories rely on official data for the construction of their theories.

Because subcultural theories rely on arrest and adjudication data, the most important explanatory category is delinquent acts committed by young urban, lower-class males. Although there is an emphasis on young lower-class males as the subject of delinquency theorizing, it does not follow that demonstrations of the increased incidence of middle-class or female delinquency will contradict subcultural theories; rather such studies fall outside the scope of the theory.

Because subcultural theories portray delinquents as young lower-class males, alternative theories are needed. Theories are absorbed, converted and sometimes reified into treatment orientations, and theoretical neglect of female and middle-class

---

*Although these theories were presented briefly in the paper on Social Control Perspectives, this paper presents a more detailed view of the subcultural theories which are held in high repute by many delinquent theorists.

delinquency leads to a one-sided allocation of treatment resources. The recent interest and possible increase in female delinquency, for example, finds practitioners with an unclear picture of female delinquency and what can be done about it.

2. Subcultural theories assume that crime and delinquency are caused by elements in the environment.

Subcultural theories place primary causal weight on the social conditions that produced the criminal. These social conditions include middle-class expectations for lower-class juveniles (Cohen), opportunity structures (Cloward and Ohlin), lower-class culture (Miller) and cultural beliefs about the use of violence (Wolfgang and Ferracuti).

The assumptions that it is "kinds of environments" that cause crime and delinquency distinguish subcultural theories from those that find the causes of crime within the individual. These kinds of theories look for individual differences in physical traits, psychic conflict, etc. (Reasons, 1974).

The "kinds of environment" assumption in subcultural theories often leads to a lack of attention to the political nature of crime. In those theories that emphasize power and conflict, crime is viewed "as phenomena created by individuals in concerted action to have their definitions of rightness win out and became legitimated in public policy, i.e., laws and regulations," (Reasons, 1974:9).

3. Subcultural theories assume that crime and delinquency are the consequence of a conflict of conduct norms.

By a conflict of conduct norms we mean that the rules of conduct which govern the specific life situations of persons in one group may disagree with those of another group. Where such normative disagreement is defined by one group as a violation of criminal law, the act is defined as a crime or delinquent act (Sellin, 1938).

In examining the four major subcultural theories and the acts defined as crime or delinquency, a major difference becomes apparent. For Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), normative conflict need not exist prior to the evaluation of delinquent subcultures; it is a product of the encounter between lower-class and middle-class expectations. For Miller (1958) and Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967), normative conflict can exist independent of an encounter between lower-class juveniles and middle-class expectations.

If there is a conflict of conduct norms as a result of delinquent subcultures in Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin's theories, then it is necessary to explain how such subcultures evolve. For Cloward and Ohlin and, to a lesser extent, Cohen, the development of delinquent subcultures occurs because of a discrepancy between culturally approved goals and institutionalized means. Cohen believes this discrepancy occurs because working class boys cannot meet the standards imposed by middle-class dominated institutions, particularly the school. For Cloward and Ohlin, legitimate opportunity structures, available primarily through education, are blocked to lower-class aspirations of success. (The next section deals with this issue at length.)

For Cloward and Ohlin and Cohen the problem is one of explaining a conflict of conduct norms where none was assumed to exist. This was accomplished by positing a lack of integration between socially approved means and ends. Alternatively, if the assumption is that a conflict of conduct norms exists independent of a juvenile's encounters with middle-class expectations, then the explanatory problem is one of describing the character of the group which generates behavior viewed as criminal by a middle-class dominated criminal justice system.

For Miller, it is the attention to and involvement with lower-class values or "focal concerns" which lead to delinquency. Delinquency is not a response to middle-class norms; rather it is a byproduct of a lower-class style of life.

Focusing specifically on violence, Wolfgang and Ferracuti make similar assumptions about the cause of delinquency. Certain groups, among them some portions of the lower-class, support an expectation that violence can be used in certain types of social situations. This expectation is learned through patterns of socialization, including methods of disciplining children, which differ in the lower-class in contrast to the middle-class. The resulting higher incidence of violence for lower-class juveniles is not, therefore, a result of an encounter with middle-class norms, but is a product of an existing style of life.

4. Subcultural theories assume that criminals and delinquents are psychologically normal, although psychological concepts may be used as intervening variables.

Wolfgang and Ferracuti, for example, assume that the methods of disciplining a lower-class child in a way that reinforces violent responses in adults is part of a pattern of socialization which distinguishes lower-class from middle-class parents, but this difference is not pathological in nature.

A clear use of psychological variables exists in Cohen's theory where a psychoanalytic defense mechanism, reaction formation, occurs in delinquent gangs. However, reaction formation occurs as a result of the juveniles' encounter with the "middle-class measuring rod", thus serving as an intervening variable. In addition, Cohen does not imply that the development of a reaction formation, while important to his subcultural theory, indicates any more psychological abnormality than can be found in the general population. What is distinctive about this defense mechanism is that it occurs in the context of social "rejections" of the individual.

Instead of emphasizing psychological variables, most subcultural theories look to groups and the organization of institutions as a basis for treatment. For example, Wolfgang and Ferracuti suggest that violent crimes can be reduced by breaking up the propinquity of the actors in a subculture of violence, thus destroying the mutual reinforcement that increases acts of violence. By dispersing families and individuals in middle-class areas, acts of violence are not reinforced while more acceptable patterns are rewarded.

5. Criminal justice organizations are secondary or contributing causes of crime and delinquency.

In contrast to labeling perspectives which see the deviant role emerging from interaction between the offender and the police, courts, and corrections, subcultural theories view these organizations as having secondary importance.

Cloward and Ohlin, for example, indicate that an act defined as delinquent by agents of criminal justice is viewed differently by juveniles. However, this aspect is given importance because it establishes a theoretically significant category: beyond that classificatory function, the official response has little importance in explaining delinquency.

Instead, subcultural theories grant more importance to the school, the community, and the organization of the family in causing delinquency. The discussion given under assumption 3 (that delinquency is a product of the conflict of cultural norms) serves to indicate which organization is important for each subcultural theory.

From the viewpoint of policy, an obvious implication of subcultural theory is that programs to reduce delinquency will accomplish more if they are directed toward community organizations in contrast to criminal justice organizations. Most of the important causative events for subcultural theorists occur before, or are independent of, the actions of criminal justice organizations.

Most of the important causative events for subcultural theorists occur before, or are independent of, the actions of criminal justice organizations. Insofar as the goal of prevention is to reduce or eliminate juvenile contacts with formal agents of social control, it would seem that subcultural theories provide more useful guidelines by indicating community organizations that play a role in generating crime and delinquency.

Of course, a simple implication of the labeling perspective is that if official contact with criminal justice organizations increases the probability of accepting a deviant role, then programs should be directed toward reducing the frequency of such contact. Labeling theorists are quite clear that reduced contact could be accomplished by changing aspects of criminal justice organizations. For example, police discretion exercised in a discriminatory fashion could be circumscribed by a more careful delineation of the juvenile code. But the criminal justice system does not exist in a vacuum; discretionary behavior of criminal justice officials is supported by a broader community. Ultimately, programs of prevention must take account of community organizations and here the labeling approach is of less value than subcultural theories.

The reason for the lower degree of utility is not that labeling perspectives will not grant a causative role to community organizations, it is that they do not distinguish among them. In discussing primary and secondary deviation, Lemert states:

> Primary deviation is assumed to arise in a wide variety of social, cultural, and psychological contexts, and at best has only marginal implications for the psychic structure of the individual ... Secondary deviation is deviant behavior, or social roles based on it .... (Lemert, 1967:17)

If the labeling process is a progression from primary to secondary deviation, "the original 'causes' of the deviation recede and give way to the central importance of the disapproving, degradational, and isolating reactions of society" (Lemert, 1967:17). Using a labeling perspective, a prevention program aimed at the "original causes" of the deviation receives little theoretical direction; "a wide variety of social, cultural and psychological contexts" are of little value as theoretical underpinnings for a program. By contrast, subcultural theories point to rather specific features of organizations like schools and families as areas where prevention programs can function.

6. Subcultural theories assume that structural elements are the most important causes of crime and delinquency.

Subcultural theories posit a set of circumstances confronting or characterizing juveniles which, if they exist, lead more or less automatically to crime and delinquency. To say that subcultural theorists ignore the process of "becoming a delinquent" is to say that delinquency is not created through a series of interactional contingencies which, if met in a certain fashion, lead to delinquency. The analogue is not a "decision tree" where a series of decisions lead to delinquency; rather the subculture model is one of a set of circumstances in which the juvenile finds himself and to which he responds by delinquent acts.

In Cloward and Ohlin's theory for example, once the juvenile is convinced that legitimate opportunities are no longer available, the alternative is often an exploitation of illegitimate opportunities. Which set (or which delinquent subculture) he will participate in is determined by the community settings and his success in utilizing illegitimate opportunities.

7. Subcultural theories assume that extensive institutional changes are not needed in the contemporary American social order to reduce or eliminate crime and delinquency.

In contrast to theories of delinquency found in the "new criminology" (see Krisberg, 1975), subcultural theories do not advocate massive changes in the economic or political orders in American society. Radical theory sees the cause of criminal behavior as rooted in the economic order of capitalism and in such factors as racism and sexism that arise in a capitalistic society. Concomitantly, a radical approach to delinquency posits that such societal changes as a redistribution of income are necessary to prevent and control delinquency.

The subcultural theories on the other hand do not share this view that a general reordering of the dominant social order is a necessary step for the prevention of delinquency. Rather, they take a more functionalist view and see contemporary social institutions as having both functional and dysfunctional consequences. Cohen, for example, sees the middle-class schools as quite functional for educating the middle-class youth for productive careers in the occupational structure, but as dysfunctional in that they produce the frustrations that lead to delinquent subcultures among lower-class youth. The orientation of the subcultural theorists, therefore, is towards ameliorating the existing order to compensate its dysfunctional consequences rather than reordering the system itself.

## Summary of Theoretical Propositions

Although there are a variety of subcultural theories of delinquency, most of them conform to one of the two basic approaches--either that of anomie or of culture conflict. We will summarize two leading theories in each of these approaches and use these four theories as the major orienting principle of this essay.

The Anomie Tradition--Theories of delinquent behavior that use the concept of anomie as a causative agent stem primarily from the work of Robert K. Merton, especially as it is presented in "Social Structure and Anomie" (1957). The most direct of Merton's students are Cloward and Ohlin, as can be seen in their work, Delinquency and Opportunity (1960).

Cloward and Ohlin deal with two basic issues: (1) Why do lower-class urban males exhibit such high degrees of criminal behavior? And (2) whataccounts for the particular type of criminal behavior that is exhibited? The answer to the first question lies in what they call the legitimate opportunity structure and is a direct extension of Merton's theory.

Contemporary American culture has as one of its major orienting values the notion of universal success goals. That is, the goals or ends of human activity--status, respect, educational and economic prosperity--are held out for everyone to attain. Regardless of where the individual starts in the social structure or who he is demographically, the goal is assumed to be the same. Moreover, there is also the ideological myth of equal access to the means to achieve these ends. Hence, all one needs to do is to apply oneself and one is likely to achieve success or at least a reasonable facsimile of it.

The problem, and the cause of delinquent behavior, comes about with the conflict between these cultural values and the realities of the social structure. For Cloward and Ohlin, the myth of equal access is just that--a myth. In reality, the members of the lower classes are denied equal access to the legitimate means or avenues to the success goals. Differences in educational and culture, as well as the structure of society, provide barriers that effectively thwart the lower-class youth's ability to use legitimate means to arrive at the prescribed ends (see Cloward and Ohlin, 1960:97-104). In other words, the legitimate opportunity structure is closed, or perceived as closed.

When this occurs, there is a strong tendency for the lower-class youth to vacillate or substitute illegitimate for legitimate means. They still seek the universal success goals--especially those of economic success (see Cloward and Ohlin, 1960:90-97)--but seek to achieve them, through deviant or criminal activity.

Cloward and Ohlin summarize their position as follows:

> The disparity between what lower-class youth are led to want and what is actually available to them is a source of a major problem of adjustment. Adolescents who form delinquent subcultures, we suggest, have internalized an emphasis upon conventional goals. Faced with limitations on legitimate avenues of access to these goals, and unable to revise their aspirations downward, they experience intense frustrations; the exploration of non-conformist alternatives may be the result. (1960:86)

Thus, the primary cause of crime is the stress between socially valued ends and "acceptable" means of achieving these ends.

The result of this stress is a subcultural adaptation in which the lower-class males who experience the closed opportunity structure may band together in deviant careers. But the type of delinquent subculture that will emerge is not a random phenomenon for Cloward and Ohlin, since they also posit the existence of an illegitimate opportunity structure. Two variables control the openness of the illegitimate opportunity structure and they are learning and performance. If an individual is not able to learn what is required of him in an opportunity structure, or if he is not able to perform what he has learned, then the opportunity structure cannot be considered open.

Now for Cloward and Ohlin, there are three types of delinquent subcultures that can emerge as a response to the inability to achieve success-goals in the legitimate structure. They are:

1. The Criminal Subculture - "its members are organized primarily for the pursuit of material gain by such illegal means as extortion, fraud, and theft."

2. The Conflict Subculture - "violence is the keynote; its members pursue status ('rep') through the manipulation of force or threat of force."

3. The Retreatist Subculture - "which emphasizes the consumption of drugs." (1960:20)

The emergence of one of these subcultural forms in a particular area depends on two factors--the integration of different age levels of offenders and the integration of carriers of criminal and conventional values.

When these types of integration are present, the criminal subculture will emerge. One result of the presence of both types of integration is the availability of learning and performance structures that lead to the more functional behavior of the "pursuit of material gain." In addition, the same type of integration of the neighborhood also tends to create social control mechanisms that suppress or control the explosiveness of aggressive behavior that can result from the frustrations experienced by the closed legitimate opportunity structure. This type of community organization is descriptive of the more organized theft of the integrated slum and it tends to be controlled by the older criminals. But when these two types of integration are absent, i.e., when the lower-class areas are disorganized, social control mechanisms are absent and the conflict subculture emerges. The adult world is itself disorganized and cannot control the delinquent responses of the youth.

The final subculture that can emerge is the retreatist variety that emphasizes drug use. As with the other types, the retreatists see themselves as failures in the legitimate world, but unlike the others they are also failures in the illegitimate opportunity structure, the primary cause of delinquent behavior still lies in the legitimate structure and the stress between the universal success goals and the blocked avenues to those goals.

The second theory that we classify in the anomie tradition is that of Albert Cohen's Delinquent Boys (1955). Cohen's starting point is the discrepancy between the values of the middle-class and the values of the lower-class. Lower-class adolescents are aware of the class structure of society and are also aware of middle-class values.

Cohen believes that even though lower-class youth are aware of these values, they have not internalized them because their socialization has been somewhat different from that of a middle-class youth. For Cohen, the values which lower-class youth have learned from their parents are often in disagreement with middle-class values. For example, Cohen posits that there is a greater emphasis placed on violence and fighting in the lower-class.

Given these two sets of values, Cohen sees that the cause of delinquency is the clash between the two sets of values, especially in the educational setting.

Schools, being primarily middle-class institutions, use the values of the middle-class as the basis for measuring success and status--where status is generally defined as the granting of respect by others. The criteria for achieving status are created and defined by the middle-class and the students are measured against what Cohen calls the "middle-class measuring rod."

Since the lower-class youths are forced to attend traditional schools, they are placed in a situation in which they have to succeed according to the middle-class measuring rod in order to achieve status. Yet because of their differential socialization, they are not prepared to succeed in that situation. Indeed for Cohen they fail--they are denied status in the school system. Moreover, their failure is not simply an objective one--their knowledge of the middle-class values leads them to perceive themselves as failures. This process gives rise to what Cohen called status-frustration. The lower-class youth seeks some degree of status, but is frustrated in his attempt to attain it.

Denied status in the legitimate world, they turn to an illegitimate order--the delinquent subculture. The basis of the delinquent subculture is a reaction—formation against the middle-class values. Unable to attain status in terms of those values, they turn them upside down. The conduct of the delinquent subculture is right precisely because it is wrong from the point of view of the dominant culture.

Acting in accordance with the values of the subculture serves two functions. First, status is gained within the framework of the delinquent subculture. Second, it allows the youths to strike back at the larger value system. It is this reaction to the dominant values that give rise to Cohen's view of the subculture as non-utilitarian, malicious and negativistic (1955:24ff).

Finally, we should note that Cohen's theory postulates that status frustration gives rise not simply to delinquency but to a delinquent subculture--a group phenomenon. This is so because the delinquent subculture is an attempt to achieve status and, since the status is the granting of respect by others, the attempt can only be successful as a group phenomenon.

For both Cloward and Ohlin and for Cohen, the genesis of lower-class delinquency stems from a clash between middle-class values and the realities of the social structure. In both theories, the lower-class youth is oriented towards, and attempts to achieve, ends that are primarily defined by the middle-class. But the individual's starting point in the lower-class effectively closes the legitimate avenues of approach and directs the individual toward illegitimate and criminal careers.

Culture Conflict--The other major subcultural approach to delinquency is that of culture conflict and stems from Sellin's earlier work, Culture Conflict and Crime (1938). The first subcultural statement of this tradition we will examine is that of Walter Miller--"The Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," (1970).

Miller does not agree that the basic cause of delinquency is rooted in an unsuccessful attempt to achieve middle-class values. His theory is an attempt "to show that the dominant component of motivation underlying these acts consists in a directed attempt by the actor to adhere to forms of behavior, and to achieve standards of value as they are defined within (the lower-class) community" (1970:351). Moreover, Miller sees the lower-class culture as "a long-established, distinctively patterned tradition with an integrity of its own--rather than a so-called 'delinquent subculture' which has arisen through conflict with middle-class culture and is oriented to the deliberate violation of middle-class norms" (1970:351).

Miller defines six focal concerns of lower-class culture--trouble, toughness, smartness, autonomy, fate and excitement. Each of these concerns has a manifestation which can lead to conflict with the criminal law. That is, they prescribe behavior that, if engaged in, would likely result in the commission of a criminal act. These focal concerns as Miller indicated do not arise in a reaction-formation process but are historical values of the American lower-class.

When the individual acts in accordance with these lower-class focal concerns or norms, he is placed in the position of violating the criminal code. This is so since the criminal code is enacted by the middle-class and reflects middle-class values which do not emphasize trouble, toughness, smartness, autonomy, fate and excitement. The cultural norms of the two groups are in conflict and when the lower-class individual obeys the norms of his social class he is by definition violating the norms of the middle-class and the criminal law. The criminal behavior is not caused by a negative reaction to the middle-class norms or way of life, but is essentially a by-product of adherence to the lower-class life-style.

Furthermore, there are two structural elements in the American lower-class community that accentuate this conflict of cultural standards for male adolescents--the subjects of Miller's theory. The first is the existence of the one-sex peer group as the dominant social grouping, and the second is the inordinately high proportion of female-based households. For Miller, the major theoretical impact of the female-based household is the difficulty that male children have in learning the male role and its attendant behavior. Because of this, the one-sex peer group, in the form of the juvenile gangs, takes on added importance. It supplies not only the typical social functions of all such groups, but supplies the male role models that are missing in the home. Since the gang does perform this function for the individual, membership and status in the gang become crucial.

Miller argues that both membership and status are defined according to lower-class norms and to advance in the gang the youth has to act in accordance with these norms. Since the gang members are also in the process of learning the adult role behavior, they tend to exaggerate actions consistent with the lower-class norms. The gang members are striving for adult status and in the learning process, when they are auditioning for the role, they tend to overplay it. Their behavior is even more preoccupied with trouble, toughness, and so forth than is the behavior of the adult male.

In Miller's view, behavior that is consistent with the lower-class norms also tends to be criminal behavior since the lower-class norms and the criminal code are in substantial disagreement concerning appropriate behavior. Thus, the lower-class boy's attempt to learn the adult male role, as it is defined by Miller's focal concerns, places the youth in the situation of engaging in substantial and serious criminal behavior. Crime is therefore a byproduct or an unanticipated result of seeking status within the tradition of the American lower-class.

The last theory we will summarize is Wolfgang and Ferracuti's discussion of The Subculture of Violence (1967). These authors posit that within many larger societies there exist subcultural groupings that exhibit high rates of violent offenses because of subcultural values that allow violent responses in a variety of circumstances.

> We have said that overt use of force or violence, either in interpersonal relationships or in group interaction, is generally viewed as a reflection of basic values that stand apart from the dominant, the central, or the parent culture. Our hypothesis is that this overt (and often illicit) expression of violence . . . is part of a subcultural normative system, and that this system is reflected in the psychological traits of the subculture participants. (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967:158)

In these subcultures, the use of violence is not mandated in all circumstances nor is it allowed to be used at the whim of the individual. But "the potential resort or willingness to resort to violence in a variety of situations emphasizes the penetrating and diffusive character of this culture theme (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967:159). Thus, the value to resort to violence is similar to other cultural values in that it is both prescribed and proscribed depending on the situation.

Furthermore, the emphasis on violence does not exist in the abstract but is internalized by the members of the subculture as constitutive elements of their personalities. The issue is not that they may engage in violence but that they must in certain circumstances. If violence is a common subcultural response to certain stimuli, penalties should exist for deviation from this norm. The comparatively nonviolent individual may be ostracized . . . he is most likely to be treated with disclaim or indifference (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967:155-156). The more subjective side of this coin is that the individual does not have to deal with guilt feelings when he engages in violence since, according to his subculture, he should be violent.

As with Miller, the cause of a crime is found in the obedience to cultural standards that happen to be in conflict with the cultural standards that are embodied in the criminal law. The conflict is between cultural systems and cultural values and is not necessarily mental conflict going on within the individual.

## Scientific Support for Subcultural Theories

Empirical Support for Subcultural Theories--The major empirical study of the validity of subcultural theories was conducted by Short and Strodtbeck (1970), and tested the propositions of the theories of Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin and Miller. The subjects that were used in the study were gang boys who were members of the Program for Detached Workers of the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago, and lower- and middle-class non-gang members who were used as control subjects. Each subject was asked to respond to a number of images on the semantic differential scale in order to measure the youth's adherence to cultural values.

> The images to be rated were chosen to represent salient examples of instrumental or dominant goal activity, leisure-time activity, and ethical orientation for each of five theoretically significant subcultures - middle class, lower class, conflict, criminal and retreatist. (Short and Strodtbeck, 1970:321).

The three subcultural theories were summarized and ten specific hypotheses were created that would allow for an empirical test of the theories using semantic differential data. For example, the following hypothesis was created to test Cohen's theory:

> Gang boys evaluate the middle class images lower than do lower class and middle class boys. (Short and Strodtbeck, 1970:327).

This hypothesis was derived from Cohen's position that gang members, because of the reaction-formation, withdraw their support from middle-class values and attach it to the values of the delinquent subcultures. If the data gathered by Short and Strodtbeck verified this hypothesis, then one could say that one of Cohen's major propositions has at least some empirical validity. If the data do not conform to this hypothesis, it would raise questions about the validity of Cohen's theoretical stance. The other nine hypotheses were derived in a similar fashion and the results can be interpreted in the same manner--that is, either supporting or questioning the theoretical stance.

The results of this study are somewhat mixed. "The data imply that acceptance of middle-class prescriptive norms . . . is quite general, while middle-class proscriptive norms . . . either decline in force or are rejected more strongly as social level goes down (Short and Strodtbeck, 1970:337). In other words, the gang boys" still hold or grant legitimacy to middle-class images such as: "someone who works for good grades at school" or "someone who likes to read good books." They do not, according to these data, repudiate such values. At the same time, however, gang boys are more apt to support such lower-class and deviant images as: "someone who likes to spend his spare time hanging on the corner with his friends" and "someone who is a good fighter with a tough reputation."

In terms of the three theories, the data offer the least support for Cohen.

> In any case, the delicacy of the prescriptive-proscriptive balance achieved in their evaluations by gang boys raises the question of whether it indicates ambivalence toward middle-class culture as a whole of the sort claimed by Cohen . . . However, given that the hypothesis of reaction formation does not seem to be supported, and that ambivalence can be said to exist whenever competing alternatives are present, the concept of ambivalence by itself lacks explanatory force. (Short and Strodtbeck, 1970:338).

The other two theories receive somewhat more support but, like Cohen's, seem to overstate the case. The gang boys do support the illegitimate opportunity structure as Cloward and Ohlin suggest and they also support lower-class and deviant values as Miller suggests, but they do not withdraw support from the legitimate opportunity structure as both theories suggest. "Certainly, if the finding (of support for middle-class values) is valid, three separate theoretical formulations failed to make sufficient allowance for the meaningfulness of middle-class values to members of gangs (Short and Strodtbeck, 1970:338). It seems that gang boys have kept middle-class values and have added to them, either because of opening illegitimate opportunity structures or historical lower-class values, alternate, illegitimate values. A wider perspective may also explain the "legitimate" opportunity structure more accurately.

Thus, there is support for the central notion of subcultural theories that crime results from a conflict of norms--that members of delinquent subcultures act in accordance with norms that are in disagreement with the norms that are stated in the criminal law. There is no support for the isolationism of subcultural theories--the image that gang members withdraw from the legitimacy of middle-class norms (Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin) or that they were never oriented toward those norms to begin with (Miller). In terms of delinquency prevention, the situation does not seem to be as difficult as the theories would have one believe.

In addition to Short and Strodtbeck's major work, there are a variety of other studies that test all or some of these theories. (See for example, Voss and Elliott, 1968, and Empey and Lubeck, 1968). In a general review of these empirical studies, Brand (1966) concluded that there is general support for:

1. "The contention that there are status problems among lower-class boys."

2. "The existence of differential opportunity structures."

3. "The existence of various types of delinquent subcultures." (Brand 1966:38)

Moreover, another review of subcultural theories and research concludes that:

> There seems, therefore, to be much support for theories which emphasize the importance of status and membership of groups for adolescents . . . On the other hand, the lower-class subculture does seem different from middle-class forms of behavior. There is ample evidence to suggest that although boys may not personally feel frustrated or reject middle-class values, the norms of the subculture reflect the objective fact that school and work fail to provide a framework for social relationships for those in the lower social classes, and that the delinquent subculture does provide an alternative system of values and norms which enable the boy to achieve membership of, and status within, a meaningful group. (Hood and Sparks, 1970:109).

Although Hood and Sparks see this general support existing, they also indicate that the data do not support the notion that the delinquent subculture "demands delinquent and so commits the delinquent" or that there are such distinct subcultures "pursuing quite separable styles of life" as Cloward and Ohlin suggest (Hood and Sparks, 1970:108).

In general, there is general empirical support for these theories, but in some specific aspects they are all in need of revision.

Some empirical assessments of Wolfgang and Ferracuti's theory have been made, but this theory has not been tested to the same extent as the other three. One study (Ferracuti and Wolfgang, 1973) used Puerto Rican males between the ages of 25 and 45 to examine expected psychological differences between members of violent and non-violent subcultures. The subjects were drawn from the middle-class, a non-violent lower-class and a subculture of violent lower-class, and in each case the subjects were divided into non-criminal, violent criminal and non-violent criminal groups (Ferracuti and Wolfgang, 1973:17ff). Each subject was given a battery of psychological tests and appropriate hypotheses were created to allow for testing some of the theory's major propositions.

As was the case with the other theories, the results of this empirical testing was somewhat mixed.

> The results of the elaborate statistical analyses described above can be reduced to a few simple generalizations. Analysis of the Clinical Assessment mean scores of aggression rejects several crucial null hypotheses and confirms on a psychological basis the subculture of violence. However, none of the separate tests selected to measure aggression of classified subjects provided patterned responses to reject the null hypotheses. (Ferracuti and Wolfgang, 1973:94).

In other words, there was overall support for the theory based on a "clinical judgment of 'belonging to a subculture of violence,' or 'total intuitive aggression rating,' using a 1 to 5 scale" (Ferracuti and Wolfgang, 1973:77-78), but the more refined psychological tests did not uncover systematic differences.

In addition, the theory's propositions about guilt feelings are supported by the Puerto Rican study.

> From the postulate of the subculture of violence, we would expect the middle- and upper-class criminal groups to have highest scores of guilt, while the subculture of violence criminals would have guilt scores similar to the middle working class non-criminals.
>
> These sets of propositions are fully borne out in the Buss-Durkee inventory. (Ferracuti and Wolfgang, 1973:95).

In general, there is a degree of support for the orientation of the subculture of violence hypothesis, based on the Puerto Rican study. At least in a general manner, the subculture of violence members differ from other groups in terms of high aggressiveness in the personality and lower rates of guilt feelings.

For subcultural theories as a unit, the appropriate conclusion to this section seems to be that there is partial support in the empirical literature. The general thrust or orientation of the theories was not proven to be erroneous. Rather, the empirical results indicated that the theories are in need of modification and revision. Given the current state of social science, this is what one would expect and indicates that policy recommendations flowing from these theories should be given consideration tempered with an understanding of the empirical and logical limits of the theories.

Peer Support for Subcultural Theories--In terms of peer recognition and support, the subcultural theories dealt with here score rather high. In an ongoing project to assess the quality of research and theory in criminology from 1945 to 1972 (Wolfgang, Figlio and Thornberry, 1975), two measures of quality that indicate peer support among criminologists were used. The first is a citation index and the second was a survey of criminolgists asking them to nominate the 20 best books and 20 best articles in the field. Among the 600 books and 3,000 articles included in that study, the theories under discussion here ranked as follows:

| Books | Rank on Citation Counts | Rank on Peer Nominations |
|---|---|---|
| Cohen | 3 | 1 |
| Cloward and Ohlin | 4 | 2 |
| Wolfgang and Ferracuti | 12 | 23 |
| Articles | | |
| Miller | 1 | 2 |

Considering the universe of books and articles upon which these ranks are based, it is clear that subcultural theories as a group have an extremely high degree of peer support with the academic community. Indeed, it is unlikely that any other topic area would rank higher than subcultural theories.

The Test of Subcultural Theories in Practice--There are several reasons why it is difficult to assess the use of these theories in practice. First, because of the high level of peer recognition, it is not a distortion to say that nearly all treatment programs represent a test of some of their major assumptions about preventing delinquency. Second, the theories provide only general guidelines as to treatment; there are a variety of group counseling techniques, for example, which are congruent with the assumptions of subcultural theories, but which may produce different results. Such differences in outcomes makes it difficult to assess the utility of the theory. Third, partly as a result of the nonspecificity of theory, there is little information available comparing the relative efficacy of these theories in practice. Thus, while we are aware of claims to use subcultural theory in the Midcity Project (1962), Mobilization for Youth (1961), and the Silverlake Experiment (1966), it is difficult to assess their efficacy as demonstrations of theories in use.

Because of the generality of subcultural theory and its nonspecificity, two other questions seem more appropriate. First, are treatment and prevention programs in general successful in reducing recidivism? Second, are treatment and prevention programs based in theory more successful than those without successful theory?

The answer to both questions seems to be in the negative. In a recent review of seven reviews of numerous treatment or action programs, Riedel and Thornberry (1975) indicate:

> Our major conclusion is that there is no body of evidence which consistently supports claims that rehabilitative efforts have had an appreciable effect on recidivism. In a few isolated instances, rehabilitative efforts had caused changes in intervening variables, but this does not warrant support of a claim for effectiveness. (Riedel and Thornberry, 1975:34).

This conclusion was similar to that of the authors of the seven reports.

With regard to the question of whether explicit theory contributes to the success of a treatment project, a study by Block and Ross, not included in the Riedel and Thornberry report, suggests a negative answer. Block and Ross (1976) analyzed 78 delinquency prevention projects. Of the 78 programs analyzed, 47 programs were based on theoretical assumptions and 31 programs mentioned no explicit theory.

To determine whether greater success was obtained for programs with explicit theories, Block and Ross used three dependent variables: decreased recidivism, reduced delinquency and a positive attitude change. Programs which used no explicit theory were compared to the following types of theory: family, community, peer, school, culture, psychological, reference group and labeling theory. The authors found that programs with no explicit theory were slightly more successful than programs utilizing theory. Further, the success of programs with no explicit theory could not be explained by a lack of good design or methodology. "Programs without explicit theories tend to use better experimental designs and were more likely to use statistical measurements of success than programs with explicit theories" (Block and Ross, 1976).

## Policy Implications for Delinquency Prevention

In suggesting standards for delinquency prevention based on subcultural theories, a crucial and overriding distinction should be kept in mind--namely, between individual and structural approaches. By individual approaches we mean prevention strategies that focus on specific individuals or groups of individuals in an attempt to prevent or reduce their delinquent behavior. Structural approaches on the other hand refer to modifications in the social structure that should reduce delinquency for classes or aggregates of individuals by ameliorating the conditions that are seen as causes of crime.

All of the subcultural theories locate causes within structural or environmental factors. While some implications on an individual level can be inferred, such approaches have the character of being stop-gap measures. They are, to use an old phrase, treating symptoms rather than causes, since logically they cannot deal with the causes of delinquency which, according to the subcultural theories, are structural in nature.

One consequence of programs aimed at symptoms rather than causes is that individual approaches become perennial. As each cohort or generation comes along, the programs will have to be repeated since the causes of delinquency will still be prevalent if structural changes are not made. Thus, individual approaches alone will become permanent features of our society, will be costly because of this, and, in the long run, will be relatively ineffective. Given this orientation, the implications that follow include suggestions for structural change as well as suggestions for individual approaches.

### 1. The School

Subcultural theories point to the school as a crucial social setting in which culture conflict is engendered, diversity penalized and opportunity structures blocked for lower-class youth. Prevention efforts in the educational arena must be directed towards the opening of opportunities for all youth. Broadening opportunities may include exploration of new goals as well as new methods of achieving socially acceptable objectives. School personnel should be more aware of their potential role in discouraging and frustrating the normal aspirations of youth. Moreover, school curriculum, promotional criteria and testing procedures should not reflect class, ethnic or sexual biases.

a. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should support teacher training programs whose focus is to acquaint the teachers with the cultures of different classes and ethnic groups.

According to subcultural theorists, there are clear-cut differences between lower-class culture, which includes many ethnic minorities, and middle-class cultures. This suggests that middle-class teachers should be given an understanding of that culture. This will not eliminate the problems of middle-class imposed standards, but it should lead to an increased respect for the cultures of the students.

One way of doing this might involve the establishment of special programs of study focusing on the cultural and historical background of ethnic groups. Following the theoretical analysis of the subcultural position, we find that a major problem is the lack of understanding of other styles of life by middle-class representatives. The implication is to do what is possible to increase that understanding; this, in turn, can enhance the quality of the educational experience of all children.

b. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should support efforts to attract and hold male teachers in elementary teaching.

If Miller and Wolfgang and Ferracuti are correct, then appropriate middle-class male role models are important components in the socialization of lower-class juveniles. Providing these role models makes it possible for young males from female-based households and from families where patterns of violence are learned from the male to have an alternate model.

Our impression, while not documented, is that there is a predominance of female teachers in the lower grades and that many administrative posts in elementary schools are filled by males. We suggest that, if such is the case, support should be given to attracting more males to elementary teaching positions and retaining them in the classroom where they will have more contact with young males.

c. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should initiate programs to train teachers in the use of the native language of non-English speaking adolescents where those adolescents make up a significant proportion of their students.

Schools which have a large portion of students who speak Spanish should have bilingual teachers. Where this does not currently exist, programs should be established to provide training the second language. Being able to communicate with adolescents in their own language does not necessarily encourage students to refrain from learning better English. Clearly, adolescents in American society learn rather quickly that in a society where English is the most common language, using only a native language is a handicap. Having bilingual teachers gives the students the opportunity to understand the slang of peers and go on to improve and correct his English. The resulting increased command of English should also make it easier for adolescents to obtain jobs at a later time.

d. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should begin their efforts in the preschool years through programs that prepare the lower-class child for school.

Subcultural theories all indicate the importance of different socialization patterns and different value systems for the genesis of lower-class crime. The first institution where these differences seem have an impact on the behavior and attitudes of the youth is the school system, so delinquency prevention should begin with an attempt to alleviate the negative consequences of these differences in the educational process.

Programs such as Head Start and Get Set should be fostered so that the lower-class child is better prepared to enter formal schooling "behind the eight ball." Specific objectives related to delinquency prevention should be built into these programs and the staffs and teachers in them should be exposed to the objectives and techniques of delinquency prevention. Such programs might seek to value non-aggressive and cooperative behavior as well as skills of non-violent conflict resolution.

e. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should fund projects that increase the likelihood of the student performing well in school.

Factors of lower-class life that inhibit the student's ability to learn should be researched and attempts should be made to ameliorate them. For example, free breakfast programs may be necessary to improve the overall health of the student and the specific ability to do well in morning classes. At the high school level, an inability to afford adequate clothing and grooming may increase truancy and further school failure. If these and similar factors contribute to poor educational attainment, they should be considered the proper province of delinquency prevention programs given the importance that frustration in the educational system plays in the formation of delinquent subcultures.

## 2. The Employment Setting

The world of work is a crucial means towards legitimate satisfaction of material wants within our society. Persons who are unfairly blocked from achieving their employment goals may resort to illegitimate or delinquent life-style. Improvements in the economic opportunity structure include the provision of more jobs, the removal of barriers of discrimination in the work place and the delivery of training to those who need specific skills to improve their employment prospects.

a. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should initiate vocational training programs designed to provide meaningful jobs in the present economy.

The intent of this recommended action is to provide an opportunity to learn marketable skills and job satisfaction. Public educational institutions have long placed too much emphasis toward college preparation and the traditional notion of success in a profession. Meaningful training should be provided in all sorts of occupations. Youth should be made aware of what kinds of realistic income and other rewards can be expected from various work situations.

b. Agencies concerned with planning and funding delinquency prevention programs should support efforts to locate young males as apprentices to skilled craftsmen.

While there are formidable problems in apprenticing juveniles to unionized craftsmen like plumbers, carpenters and bricklayers, the payoff would be substantial. Not only would the juvenile have the opportunity to work with an appropriate role model, but he would be learning job skills which would permit access to a legitimate occupation that, because of unionization, pays reasonably good salaries.

c. Agencies responsible for planning and funding delinquency programs should initiate a public-relations program directed toward major labor unions to encourage training and admission of juveniles.

In a previous statement, it was suggested that the occupational opportunity structure could be opened if juveniles could serve as apprentices for skilled craftsmen. Such a suggestion involves cooperation from labor unions that have been highly restrictive in that regard. While the use of delinquency-prone juveniles as apprentices is a highly desirable goal, access to the union might be improved by a prior public relations effort.

Such a public-relations effort could focus on encouraging unions to start apprenticeship programs for disadvantaged youth. Emphasis could be placed on unions' responsibility to the community and what they can do to reduce crime and delinquency.

### 3. Individual and Group Counseling Programs

Since delinquency is viewed in subcultural theories as a predominately lower-class phenomenon, prevention programs should focus in lower-class communities. Recent longitudinal research (Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin, 1972) has demonstrated that delinquency is even more prevalent in lower-class areas than earlier cross-sectional studies had estimated. In addition, attempts to predict delinquency have not been very successful. As a result of these two factors, the counseling program should be made available to all lower-class youth. Attempts should not be made to sort out "predelinquents" for special counseling. Rather, guidance counseling should be made a part of the regular curriculum of the school system. This approach should help diminish the stigmatizing effect of belonging to special "delinquency prevention" groups.

a. The counseling that is offered should focus on what could be called "reality counseling."

By "reality counseling" we mean that the approach should not deal with psychoanalytic or intra-psychic therapy. Delinquents are not necessarily psychologically abnormal or psychotic according to subcultural theories. Approaches that assume mental illness should not be instituted as the cornerstone of delinquency prevention.*

Reality counseling would focus on day-to-day problems that exist on the conscious or preconscious levels. For example, attempts could be made to make the youth more aware of the values of delinquent subcultures. Once that is done, the economic and social costs of acting in accordance with those values can be made clear--you can orient your life to toughness or trouble, but if you do these are the consequences you and your family should expect to face. The extent to which delinquency is increased because of the youth's false notions of the consequences of delinquency is unknown, but such an awareness could well reduce the overall amount of delinquency.

---

*This does not imply that mental illness is non-existent in the lower-class, nor that some youth may be in need of therapy.

Similarly, Matz (1964) has indicated that gangs operate on the notion of pluralistic ignorance. As a group, each member thinks the others expect him to be delinquent, but in reality the expectations are not that uniform or that strong when the gang members are interviewed separately. Reality counseling could serve to emphasize that one can deviate from subcultural norms since those norms are not held too very strongly in the first place.

In essence, reality counseling would teach juveniles what we know about delinquency and juvenile gangs in an attempt to reduce delinquency. It is an attempt to reduce pluralistic ignorance and to make the youth more aware of subcultural variations in society and the effect of acting in accordance with politically powerless subcultures.

b. Counseling should attempt to change the youth's perceptions about the openness of legitimate opportunity structures.

The first suggestions were aimed at making the educational and occupational structures more open and more viable alternatives to lower-class youth. Even if that were done, if the perceptions of the juveniles were not changed, it is unlikely that there would be a great change in delinquency.

The counseling will have to emphasize what has been done, what is being done, and what is planned to improve the chances of lower-class youth in the legitimate world. Lower-class youth should be taught to take advantage of every opportunity that is available to them.

This implies two things. First, the programs to implement these suggestions have to be well-coordinated with the counseling programs. They cannot be contradictory or independent. Second, the attempts to open avenues to the legitimate opportunity structure will have to be honest and realistic. If the counseling tries to convince these juveniles to take advantage of opportunities to become better car washers, they are doomed before they begin. That simply is not enough and the programs will lose credibility.

4. Programs in Support of Families

a. Agencies responsible for planning and funding delinquency programs should develop and implement programs of family counseling.

One important application of family counseling programs is in the area of child discipline. If Wolfgang and Ferracuti are correct in their assertions that lower-class parents use physical punishment while middle-class parents use psychological punishment and that the former reinforces violent responses, then family counseling can focus on that area. Such family counseling could offer lower-class families the opportunity to explore other forms of child discipline, especially those methods which seem to be supportive in the developmental process of children.

Such a program is currently being used in the Philadelphia area by the Sisters of Good Shepherd. Parents who feel they are having problems with the disciplining of their children can join a group of other parents for eight sessions where, with a trained therapist, they explore various methods of disciplining children. While this seems to be a promising approach, evaluation is not yet complete for the project.

b. Agencies that fund and plan delinquency prevention programs should support and implement family income maintenance programs such as the negative income tax.

Subcultural theories, especially Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin argue that frustrations in achieving middle-class life-styles, especially in the economic realm, lead to delinquency. While some of the other standards are aimed at alleviating this frustration through educational and occupational changes, they will take some time to have an impact on lower-class life-styles. Negative income tax programs, however, would have an immediate impact in raising the standard of living and in helping lower-class families to move towards middle-class life-styles. This being so, it should reduce the frustrations experienced by both the youth and the youth's family and concomitantly reduce the attractiveness of illegitimate means.

As Short and Strodtbeck found, the lower-class youths do not repudiate middle-class values, but add to them the alternate, illegitimate values. A negative income tax should make the middle-class values more viable for lower-class youth and hence better commit them to non-criminal life-styles.

Finally, we suggested dispersing the subculture would reduce the adherence to deviant values and be effective in reducing criminal behavior. The increase in family income brought about by a negative income tax should make the families more mobile and should facilitate the dispersal of the subculture.

### 5. Reducing Housing Segregation

Wolfgang and Ferracuti suggested the concept of dispersing subcultures in order to reduce allegiance to subcultural values of violence.

> The residential propinquity of the actors in a subculture of violence has been noted. Breaking up this propinquity, dispersing the members who share intense commitment to the violence value, could also cause a break in the intergenerational and intragenerational communication of this value system. (Wolfgang and Ferracuti, 1967:299)

This position could also be logically derived from the other theories, especially Miller's. All of them would support the notion that subcultures receive much of their strength from numbers, propinquity and cohesiveness.

The primary problem with this standard is its "big brother" aspect of moving families from lower- to middle-class areas. Yet this aspect can be blunted considerably by the use of indirect and voluntary approaches. For example, in the process of urban renewal, small pockets of lower-income houses can be built in predominately middle-income areas and families could move into them according to whatever criteria are currently used by the urban renewal office.

A similar indirect approach can be seen in a recent New Jersey court decision that held that developing suburban areas had to zone a certain proportion of their land for low-income housing. The zoning regulations could not be such that only expensive single-unit dwellings could be erected. Delinquency prevention agencies, by supporting such approaches and by educating the appropriate bureaucracies to the impact that such approaches would have on delinquency prevention, can indirectly foster the dispersal of delinquent subcultures.

### 6. Community Redevelopment

Subcultural theories indicate that lower-class areas that are disorganized and socially chaotic are more prone to produce crime, especially violent crime. (See Cloward and Ohlin's discussion of types of subcultures.) Relatedly, Oscar Newman (1971) has empirically indicated the impact of architectural design on the rates and type of criminal behavior.

Delinquency prevention programs should work with urban renewal programs so that when plans are made for new housing, the importance of small units in relatively small neighborhoods intermingled with middle-income housing is not lost. Urban renewal that simply relocates and consolidates delinquent subcultures should be opposed. If huge high-rise, congested housing projects continue to be the order of the day, it will be virtually impossible for the other standards recommended here to be effective.

Similarly, delinquency prevention agencies should encourage programs like Philadelphia's urban homesteading project in which abandoned homes are refurbished and made available to low-income families at modest rates. This tends to keep the flavor and atmosphere of old neighborhoods that are less disorganized than the newer more anonymous housing units. Such neighborhoods may not eliminate delinquency, but they should be able to reduce the amount of crime, especially in the serious, violent crime category.

References:

1. Block, Richard and Ross, David J. "A Technique for Utilizing Precoded Variables for the Review of Programs in Criminal Justice Research," in Marc Riedel and Duncan Chappell (eds.) Issues in Criminal Justice: Planning and Evaluation. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1976.

2. Brand, Geralyn. "Subcultural Theories of Delinquency: Survey and Critique of Empirical Research." Mimeo, University of Pennsylvania, 1966.

3. Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. New York: Free Press, 1955.

4. Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press, 1960.

5. Empey, LaMar T., et al., "The Silverlake Experiment: A Community Study in Delinquency Rehabilitation." Progress Report Number 3. Los Angeles: Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, 1966.

6. Empey, LaMar T. and Lubeck, Steven G. "Conformity and Deviance in the 'Situation of Company'," American Sociological Review, Vol. 33, #5, pp. 760-774, 1968.

7. Ferracuti, Franco and Wolfgang, Marvin E. Psychological Testing of the Subculture of Violence. Rome: Bulzoni, 1973.

8. Hood, Roger and Sparks, Richard. Key Issues in Criminology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

9. Krisberg, Barry. Crime and Privilege: Toward a New Criminology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

10. Lemert, Edwin. Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

11. Matza, David. *Delinquency and Drift*. New York: Wiley, 1964.

12. Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomie," pp. 131-160 in *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press, 1957.

13. Miller, Walter B. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," pp. 351-363 in Wolfgang, M.E., *et al*., *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*. New York: Wiley, 1970, 2nd edition.

14. Miller, Walter B. "The Impact of a 'Total Community' Delinquency Control Project," *Social Problems*, 10:2 (1962); pp. 168-191.

15. Newman, Oscar. *Architectural Design for Crime Prevention*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

16. Reasons, Charles E. "Paradigm Conflict in Criminology," in Marc Riedel and Terence P. Thornberry (eds.) *Crime and Delinquency: Dimensions of Deviance*, pp. 4-17. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

17. Riedel, Marc and Thornberry, Terence P. "Measurement and the Effectiveness of Correctional Programs." Educational Developmental Center, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Wilkes College, 1975.

18. Sellin, Thorsten. *Culture Conflict and Crime*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1938.

19. Voss, Harwin L. and Elliott, Delbert S. "Delinquency Opportunity and the Prediction of Delinquent Behavior," *Criminologica*, Vol. 6, #2, pp. 39-51, 1968.

20. Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Ferracuti, Franco. *The Subculture of Violence: Toward an Integrated Theory in Criminology*. Tavistock, 1967.

21. Wolfgang, Marvin E.; Figlio, Robert and Sellin, Thorsten. *Delinquency in a Birth Cohort*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

22. Wolfgang, Marvin E.; Figlio, Robert M.; and Thornberry, Terence P. "An Evaluation of Research and Theory in Criminology, 1945-1972," Unpublished manuscript, University of Pennsylvania, 1975.

# III - COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES OF DELINQUENCY

Psychological theories focus on processes which occur within an individual, and delinquent behavior is seen as one manifestation of those processes. The differences among the various psychological theories rest with the emphasis or importance of factors such as internal drives or social interaction, the kinds of data on which they were formulated, and how the theories were derived. They differ with regard to the methods by which the internal psychological states are observed and inferred, and the ways in which changes are to be instituted. But in all of them, the focus is on the individual's mental processes and the resultant behavior which is manifested.

The large body of literature dealing with sociological aspects of delinquency is sometimes considered to be contradictory or working at cross-purposes to psychological perspectives. It is admitted that the emphasis of these two approaches to delinquency differ, but they can be seen to be complementary rather than contradictory. In attempting to formulate workable prevention programs, many perspectives are needed to develop a complete and comprehensive plan. It is obvious that social structural constraints can affect individuals differentially on a psychological level. For example, behavioral restrictions in schools can be interpreted differentially by students, depending on their backgrounds. Not only social aspects, but genetic, biological and constitutional factors may have an effect on human interactions. Part of the problem is that theories from one field are often presented so as to appear to operate in a vacuum without these other influences. This is true of psychological theories, too, although some writers have integrated social and psychological aspects of behavior.

Psychology does have as an area of study relatively stable factors such as body types, traits, hormonal states and instincts which are known to influence behavior. It includes within it the relationship between these factors and delinquency. There are the constitutional, genetic or biological factors which affect behavior, but the research linking these factors to delinquency has been inconclusive or of such low quality as to destroy the possibility of drawing valid inferences. Moreover, it is not immediately clear if these areas have any consequences for prevention. This paper will deal with theories which explain socialization processes and which seem to be more scientific in character as well as offering direct implications for delinquency prevention.

The theoretical perspectives which are included here are the psychoanalytic tradition, learning theory, and social psychology in the form of symbolic interactionism.

## The Psychoanalytic Tradition

Freud--The most important approach in psychodynamic theories is Freudian theory and the resultant schools or theories which are derived from psychoanalytic theory. It was formulated at the end of the 19th century and early part of the 20th century by Sigmund Freud, a physician residing in Vienna. Some basic ideas developed by Freud included the concept of the unconscious (mental processes which occur below the level of consciousness), psychosexual stages of development (oral, anal and genital stages), and psychoanalysis as a method for effecting behavioral change. The theory evolved from observations of patients suffering intrapsychia conflicts and seeking aid through psychoanalysis. The data collected is the introspection or words of the patient.[1]

Freud's theory attempts to explain how people become socialized from the time of birth to adulthood. Hypothesized stages of development coincide with age-specific biological, social and cultural development. For example, the oral stage is the first an individual experiences primarily due to the biological necessities of babyhood, i.e., obtaining nourishment via sucking from breast or bottle. It is the primary means of obtaining pleasure and release of tension (from the hunger drive). Many other pleasures are associated with this stage, e.g., large amounts of attention from the mother.

Other age-specific stages are the anal, when a child is physically able and culturally expected to control his bowels (usually between one to three years of age), and the genital stage when the child develops sexual identification (usually between three to six years of age). Each stage brings increased socialization demands on the child, especially in the way the child deals with basic, innate drives characteristic of every person.

Psychoanalytic theory assumes that the way in which the innate drives are dealt with by the individual will categorize one as "normal," "neurotic," "criminal," etc. Freud distinguished two innate drives, the sexual and the aggressive, which create states of tension which strive toward gratification. In psychoanalytic terminology, these states of tension are referred to as the id. The id operates on an unconscious level, constantly seeking discharge and objects to satisfy the drives. To deal with the id, a child eventually develops a reality-testing aspect of mental life, the ego. The ego evaluates a situation and logically derives the line of behavior which will maximize gratification and minimize pain.

Through interaction with the real world and especially the demands and expectations of parents, a third psychic aspect to the personality is evolved--the superego. This is roughly equivalent to the idea of conscience in that it attempts to suppress drives and allows feelings of pride when one has lived up to goals and expectations. The superego is thought to undergo its most important development in the years, three to six, because of the need to control sexual and aggressive drives directed toward the parents. It is in this process that the sexual identification mentioned previously is evolved.

Ideally, the individual will be able to sublimate the energy of sexual drives to non-sexual goals. For example, the creative activities of painting and writing are generally interpreted by psychoanalysts as a sublimation of sexual energies from the anal stage. Smoking is seen as a carry-over from the oral stage. If the sexual energy is not sublimated, it becomes repressed in the unconscious and is played out later as an adult in neurotic tendencies.

The role of parents in psychoanalytic theory is crucial for the psychosexual development of the child. From birth, it is the parents who not only gratify the particular needs of the child, who compel one to develop socially acceptable means of satisfying one's needs and who instill morals and values and who provide role models for the child. The theory states the need for both a stable mother and father figure for both boys and girls. A balance between strong emotional ties, independence and authority is necessary for normal psychosexual development. When this occurs, the Oedipal complex (or in the case of females, the Electra complex) is kept at bay for it is made clear that the son cannot take the place of the father with the mother. Psychoanalytic theory says that from about age five or six, all sexual urges enter a latency period until puberty at which time, the increase in sexual tendencies prevents their repression. Generally, delinquency is seen as a weakness of the internal control systems of the individual, which are particularly susceptible during adolescence.

Conflict is a central part of the theory in that the individual must mediate his own drives and the demands of the larger society; intraphysically, this can be seen as a conflict between the ego and the id as well as between the ego and the superego When pressure from the id for tension release, or the superego for repressing these impulses become too great, the individual begins to feel anxiety because of the inability to master or control conflicting demands. The adaptations which the ego uses to keep anxiety under control are referred to as defense mechanisms--"actually adaptive processes which resolve conflict and allow the organism to maintain equilibrium in the face of stress."[2] Defense mechanisms are always in operation and are a major determinant of personality development.

How an individual handles conflicts determines normality, mental illness, criminality, among other things. Psychoanalysts see mental illness, for example, as a mechanism to reduce tension and maintain equilibrium. Similarly, criminality or delinquency is also an adaptation to tension states. Because sexual and aggressive drives are universal, it is assumed that everyone is a potential criminal; evidence given for this point of view is the fantasy and dreamlife of so-called normal individuals. While everyone is a potential criminal, actual criminal behavior is a manifestation of a weakness in the internalized control system (ego or superego). Some psychoanalysts feel that delinquency is an unconscious desire for punishment, although this makes it difficult to explain the large number of "successful" delinquents and criminals.

Some psychoanalysts have further interpreted Freud's concepts. Halleck, for example, states that oppression, whether arising from social conditions such as poverty or discrimination, or a family or interpersonal relationship, is the condition which generates the adaptations mentioned above. Oppression can be real, immediate and direct or imagined, subtle and indirect. A person may feel more oppression than actually exists, e.g., a child feeling the constraints of limitations on behavior even though negotiated by both child and parents. Another individual may feel oppressed when there is no external stress; an individual with a very strong superego or conscience might do this. There are times when one feels so oppressed that one feels helpless to do anything about it. When this occurs, criminality is one possible adaptation to the feelings of helplessness. The delinquent adaption is more likely when alternative adaptations are not possible or are restricted by other people. Criminal behavior at times offer gratifications of its own and is chosen as an adaptation over other possible behaviors. Halleck states that mental illness and crime can be seen as adaptations to oppressive situations. Whereas mental illness is an alteration of the internal environment (the individual turns inwards), crime can be seen as an adaptation which attempts to ignore the rules of society. Being classified as mentally ill requires taking some action which communicates the suffering of the stressful situation (in the form of depression, a phobia, an obsession). This in turn elicits a response from others from which the mentally ill derives some gratification and possible relief from further oppression. Mental illness then is seen as an indirect attack on the particular oppressive situation, whereas crime is a direct attempt to alleviate the oppression.

Halleck indicates that deviant behavior itself can be viewed as advantageous, from a psychological point of view. (1) For example, during the planning and execution of a deviant act, the individual is free because they have defied the dictates of others being temporarily outside the control of rules and social mores. (2) Deviant behavior offers the possibility of excitement and the opportunity to creatively use abilities and skills normally not ordinarily utilized. (3) Deviance carries the possibility of change in a positive direction. (4) Deviant acts allows the opportunity to locate the source of oppression outside the self and decrease the blame of self. (5) Deviance provides a rationale for inadequacy (if it hadn't been for my turning to crime, I would have lead a successful life). From this point of view, every crime can be seen as satisfying some pleasure-seeking tendency, especially as symbolic or indirect means to gain gratification.

Erikson--A number of psychoanalysts have their basis in Freudian theory but have changed the emphasis or expanded the conceptualization to encompass social and cultural factors. These theorists include Otto Rank, Alfred Adler and Carl Jung, who have developed theories in the psychoanalytic tradition. Another one of the most widely read and quoted is Erik Erikson. He takes as a starting point Freud's theory of psychosexual development and expands it to include the context of social interaction. Critical periods of development are hypothesized where the ego must integrate "the timetable of the organism with the structure of social institutions."[3]

For Erikson, delinquent behavior results from inadequate development of a sense of identity. Adolescents, facing rapidly changing physiology and "tangible adult tasks ahead of time," "are now primarily concerned with what they appear to be in the eyes of others as compared with what they feel they are, and with the question of how to connect the roles and skills cultivated earlier with the occupational prototypes of the day."[4] This means that identity, while being resolved in adolescence, had its beginnings in the earliest days of the individual's existence. Each crucial step in a child's physical, social and moral development is an increment to identity. At each step, there are critical issues which each child must confront, e.g., basic trust vs. mistrust, autonomy vs. shame and doubt, initiative vs. guilt, industry vs. inferiority. Trust, autonomy and initiative coincide with Freud's psychosexual stages discussed earlier, the oral, anal and genital stages respectively.

"Industry versus inferiority" occurs in the period before adolescence, in the so-called latency period and involves important developments regarding the child's relationship to the society. The child begins to produce things, and skills, abilities, attention and perserverence are developed. "The fundamentals of technology are developed, as the child becomes ready to handle the utensils, the tools, and the weapons used by the big people."[5] It is in this stage that the child begins to see his role in the society, and in which he assesses his skills, abilities and status with relation to the world around him. Erikson indicates that this is where there is danger of a child developing a sense of inferiority or inadequacy.

If the child feels he does not measure up, he or she will feel doomed to mediocrity or inadequacy. It can be seen that the experiences in the schools is a critical factor at this stage, for the onset of the latency period coincides with the entrance into educational systems.

It is during puberty and adolescence that "identity versus role confusion" comes to ascendance. Erikson indicates that each of these stages is related to each of the others, and depend upon the proper development in the correct sequence. Also, each is in existence in some form before its critical time arrives. "Each comes to ascendance, meets its crisis, and finds its lasting solution during the stage indicated. But they all must exist from the beginning in some form, for every act calls for an integration of all."[6]

In adolescence, one must relive and resolve many of the issues and conflicts experienced in earlier stages of development due to changes occurring both internally and externally. The physiological changes signal the end of childhood and the necessity to look toward the future as an adult. Erikson states that the danger at this point is role confusion. Where a strong ethnic and sexual identity is not developed, "delinquent and outright psychotic episodes are not uncommon." If diagnosed and treated correctly, they will not have the "same fatal significance" they might have at other ages. Erikson indicates that when these episodes occur, it is most important not to label the youth as "criminal." The forms of delinquency referred to by Erikson seem to be of the withdrawing types such as running away, leaving school and job.

Other conflicts to be faced after identity are "intimacy versus isolation" as a young adult, "generativity versus stagnation" in maturity, and "ego integrity versus despair" in older years. The emphasis for Erikson is the individual's development interacting with the society. In the earliest stages the family is of prime importance, but social institutions such as schools, social groups like peers, social attributes of race, sex and class interact with the individual to help shape his personal identity, which in turn influences the individual's future actions.

## Learning Principles

In contrast to psychoanalysis, learning theory has been evolved primarily from laboratory experiments rather than psychotherapy. Its data comes from observation of behavior rather than the introspection of the individual. In addition, many learning theorists dispute the need to postulate intrapsychic processes such as the id, and superego, defenses and complexes. Instead, they claim that an understanding of the learning principles of conditioning, extinction, reinforcement and modeling is a more expedient method of studying behavior. According to this point of view, the process of socialization and the learning of both deviant and conforming behavior can be understood through these principles.

There is a group of learning theorists who have essentially translated Freudian principles and concepts such as ego strength and transference to a format more consistent with experimental psychologists.[7] Other learning theorists are adamant that learning theory adequately explains behavior so that these translations are unnecessary and have served to further entrench psychoanalytic assumptions and concepts that have not been tested under controlled conditions (e.g., Bandura and Walters, 1963). This paper will discuss learning principles and research which help explain how learning delinquent behavior is part of the socialization process.

Learning theory has evolved through manipulation of stimulus conditions and observing the response sequences. The classic experiment is Pavlov's conditioning of a dog's salivation response to a light which was presented in association with food.[8] After constant association, Pavlov found that the dog would salivate in response to the light in the absence of food. Through constant association of the light with the food, the dog has learned that whenever the light was shown, it would receive food, and the salivary response came in anticipation of being fed. When the light continued to be presented in the absence of food, the salivary response eventually extinguished (disappeared). Since this experiment in the early part of this century, increasingly sophisticated laboratory experiments as well as observational studies have compiled the body of literature known as learning theory, or in the case of socialization, it has been referred to as social learning.

Social learning sees deviant behavior not as a response to parental rejection (as would some psychodynamic theories), but as the influence of specific training. In other words, the child has been rewarded in some way for producing deviant behavior or has been exposed to deviant models. Stages of development are not hypothesized and learning theorists assume there will be continuity of behavior throughout childhood unless there are abrupt changes in social training practices, or in "other relevant biological or environmental variables which rarely occur in the social learning histories of most individuals during pre-adult years."[9]

The two principles which are critical in social learning are reinforcement and modeling.

Reinforcement--Rewarded behavior is learned easier than any other behavior, say learning theorists. The Hutterites are an example, where pacifism is the style of life, and aggressive behavior is unrewarded. Among the Hutterites, even under severely frustrating conditions interpersonal aggression is almost never exhibited. There are studies which show that when parents exhibit a "generalized nonpermissive and nonpunitive attitude toward aggression" they left little opportunity for aggression to be learned either through imitation or direct reinforcement. In contrast, parents of aggressive boys permitted a good deal of sibling rivalry and aggressive behavior directed toward other children which was encouraged and rewarded.

Reinforcement can be either positive or negative, i.e., a reward or punishment. In addition, a condition of "no reinforcement" or ignoring the response can be distinguished. There is a difference between negative reinforcement of punishment and extinction or no reward. Extinction refers to the absence of any kind of response to the behavior made. A parent trying to extinguish whining in a child, for example, could completely ignore all such behavior. Another means of ridding the child of whining is through punishment. The same parent could spank the child whenever there is whining. However, the difference between the two situations is not only the administration of punishment, but that the child was able to get the attention of the parent. In other words, in this situation the child not only received a punishment bue he or she also received a positive reward--the attention of the parent. The actual reinforcement to the behavior of the child is ambivalent in this instance and this ambivalence may actually encourage undesirable behavior. Learning theorists argue that the manipulation of reinforcement upon exhibited behavior determines much of the content of childhood socialization.

The effect of reinforcement or reward has been intensively studied by researchers. Laboratory studies found that rather than rewarding after every correct response, an intermittent schedule of reinforcement produces behavior which is more difficult to extinguish (have disappear). In other words, a response rewarded once every six times that response is made, or reinforced randomly, is less likely to be extinguished than if reinforcement is given every time the response is exhibited. In terms of child rearing practices, intermittent reinforcement is most often practiced by parents who reward some but not all good behavior and punish some but not all undesirable behavior.

The effect of rewarding certain categories of behavior has been researched quite extensively by learning theorists, particularly the behavior of aggression. Researchers have found that parents who permit and reward aggressive behavior in the home have aggressive children; however, parents who do not permit and punish aggressive behavior in the home have children who direct little aggression toward their parents, but exhibit highly aggressive behavior outside the home, both toward adults and peers. Children, then, learn very quickly to discriminate place, time and people that will allow certain behaviors to be exhibited.

On the other hand, to produce children who are compassionate with others requires that different sorts of behavior have to be rewarded. Children who are rewarded for dependency behavior tend to have interactions with their own peers which are attentive, affectionate, protective and reassuring. (Dependency is defined as seeking proximity and physical contact, help, attention, reassurance and approval.)

Learning theory says the effects of reinforcement from earliest childhood can be seen in that most children grow older, spend less time with their parents, and as a result receive little or no reinforcement from parents, but children will continue to maintain response patterns learned from parents long into adulthood.

Modeling--In addition to rewarded behavior, imitation plays an important role in the learning process. New responses can be learned by observing others without the observer performing any overt act himself or receiving direct reinforcement. This is referred to as role modeling where a child, for example, imitates the behavior of a parent or another person without any observable reward for doing so. Imitative behavior can be also seen in symbolic models where verbal or written instructions are presented. Written instructions include such things as technical manuals whereas pictorial models would include films, television and other audio visual means. In terms of influencing children, the pervasiveness of television-viewing is believed to have a tremendous impact on modifying social norms and shaping behavior. Especially since observing an actual performance of such behavior (such as television programs) presents more relevant cues with greater clarity to children than verbal instructions of parents. Television may become as influential as parents in shaping children's behavior. An experiment by Bandura, Ross and Ross[10] illustrates this. Children were presented with adult models portraying aggression toward an inflated doll, a film of the same behavior or a cartoon character making the same aggressive responses. Earlier studies showed that children exposed to adult models aggressively attacking the doll, themselves made imitative aggressive responses after being mildly frustrated. However, children viewing the cartoon presentation and the films exhibited as much aggression as did the children observing the adult model. The children learned a whole pattern rather than just portions of it. A distinguishing aspect of modeling is that the observor learns patterns of behavior in large segments or in their entirety rather than on a slow, gradual basis.

Studies have also shown the modeling effects of parents upon their children. Bandura studied the child-raising patterns of boys who were more withdrawn or aggressive than average clinical populations. Neither set of boy's parents were found to be particularly rejecting of their sons. However, they were markedly different in their training procedures and modeling behavior. Aggressive or inhibited behavior was a desirable attribute to these parents, and they rewarded the behavior of their child accordingly. The modeling aspects of parental behavior was also indicated in research which showed that parents of inhibited children were relatively more inhibited in their social behavior than were parents of aggressive children. The same is true of children defined as dependent.

While some consider aggression to be the natural, unlearned response to frustration, learning theorists take the position that responses to stress are learned from observation of parental and other models of behavior during the course of a child's development. When a child encounters a stressful situation, according to this view, it is much more likely that he will exhibit imitative behavior rather than to embark on a trial-and-error process.

Just as a specific response or a whole pattern of behavior is learned, larger conceptions of behavior, such as self-control, are also learned. The acquisition of self-control can again be understood in terms of imitation or modeling and direct reinforcement. Research indicates that strong prohibition against nonconformity and a conformity model resulted in a low rate of deviation whereas weak prohibition and a deviating model produce a high incidence of deviance. A high status model also appears to affect whether the observer will conform or deviate. There is evidence that performance or lack of performance of a deviant act can be vicariously transmitted to an observer "particularly if the immediate consequences to the model are apparent or the model is a person who has evidently been competent or successful in life."[11] This seems to imply that if a youth watches peers engage in theft and escape punishment, this will increase his changes of doing the same; if his friends are apprehended and incarcerated, this will decrease the likelihood of his engaging in such actions. Or another situation of learning may be that the role model of a neighborhood pimp, who has nice clothes and car and cash available to him; the apparent success of the pimp encourages the youth to imitate him even through he has information about the possibilities of being arrested or that it is illegal.

## Learning Principles and Delinquency

Learning theory does not necessarily find delinquency emergent in adolescence as do some other theories. This theory views delinquency as having its origins in behavioral patterns, possibly long established. Research has found that imitation of parent models contributes to delinquent behavior, not only when the father was adjudged criminal, but also when the mother was considered socially deviant, parental discipline was erratic, or parents were rejecting of their children.

Bandura questions the popular idea that habitual offenders are not influenced by punishment. He states that "the efficacy of punishment in modifying antisocial patterns is highly dependent on the extent to which the offender is capable of, or provided with, alternative pro-social modes of response that will permit him to attain desired social goals."[12] Unless socially acceptable responses are strongly established, punishment will lead to only minor behavior modification, and limiters to behaviors likely decrease the likelihood of detection and subsequent punishment rather than to inhibit delinquent behavior. From this perspective, delinquent behavior is so persistent not because punishment is not effective, but because the delinquent's repertory of responses are limited to primarily antisocial ones.

As was previously discussed, most behavior is intermittently reinforced, and this form of reinforcement is the most difficult to extinguish. Bandura suspects that "most persistent antisocial behavior is maintained through substantial intermittent positive reinforcement which outweights the inhibitory effects of punishment, except insofar as the latter leads to changes in the form of antisocial acts designed to maximize the offender's chances of securing further reinforcements."[13]

Observation of others' successful deviance can provide vicarious reinforcement of delinquent behavior, especially if there is personal association with other offenders. Membership in a gang of such offenders may serve to further lower any inhibitions against delinquent behavior. In addition, learning theorists state that giving up a delinquent pattern of behavior may mean losses in the social and material rewards associated with this behavior without providing substitute rewards. For example, giving up delinquent behavior may mean foregoing comfortable friends and money.

Learning theory states that psychoanalysis therapy was developed for oversocialized, inhibited patients whereas delinquents are implied to be "undersocialized, aggressive personalities." Whereas analysts are generally seen to reduce anxieties, the task with delinquents is to eliminate antisocial behavior and elicit conforming behavior. Learning theorists do this with a system of rewards. Bandura cites research in which "hardcore" delinquents were paid refreshments, candy, cigarettes and money to serve as subjects and for attendance at the laboratory. Through this immediate reinforcement, cooperation and regular attendance were established, and then social rewards were eventually substituted for the material rewards. These included opportunities to participate in various activities and acquisition of skills which would enable the youths to compete in the labor market. According to the report of the therapists, the delinquents' "no work" ethic changed, and their gang and delinquent activities decreased considerably.

In general, learning theorists have a large body of literature on behavior modification, but the basic principles can be reduced to a few. These include (1) extinction--withdrawing reinforcement so that there is no response to the behavior in question. This appears to work most effectively in positive reinforcement of desired behaviors which then become more dominant in the individual's repertory of responses. For example, a mother could ignore her child's whining bids for attention, but attend to its needs when verbalized; (2) counter-conditioning--introducing a response which is incompatible with the original response to a stimulus. An example of this is administration of a substance which produces nausea upon smoking of a cigarette; (3) positive reinforcement--rewarding of socially desirable behavior.

Learning theorists state that parents and educators are prime molders of children's behavior and most use behavior modification procedures either deliberately or unwittingly. However, few parents program the reinforcements or carefully select models that children are permitted to observe. This is complicated by the fact that parents and educators many times do not act the precepts which they are verbally endorsing; in other words, they do not do as they say. In addition, many are caught up in a popular present belief that "unconditional" love will produce sociable behavior, a belief which Bandura indicates is fallacious.

## Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism is both a theoretical perspective and a methodological orientation for social research. The main contributors to this perspective were Charles Cooley, John Dewey, and George Herbert Mead.[14] Mead's major ideas are found in his book, Mind, Self and Society.

According to Mead, people live in a meaningful world of experiences and objects. Meaning is an agreed-upon way of interpreting the social reality around us. Events, objects, and relationships become a part of the symbolic world of common meaning which we share with one another. Symbolic language is the focus of this perspective because we can only acquire meanings and definitions of others and ourselves through symbols.

Symbolic interactionism is a perspective and methodology used to study how people use symbols. Symbols are an essential ingredient in the construction of social reality as people interact with each other. It is only through interaction and the use of symbolic language that we can give meaning to events, objects and relationships of our everyday life. Some of the concepts that are useful in understanding symbolic interactionism are social behavior, self, role, significant other, generalized other, reference group, and collective definition of reality.

Social behavior is based on group life which involves working together and interacting with each other. All group life is a matter of cooperative behavior and can only be brought about by a symbolic process. This process means that each person needs to ascertain the intention of another person's action and then must make his or her own response on the basis of that intention. Our social behavior in groups can be cooperative when we respond to other people on the basis of their intentions, both present and future intentions.[15] It is through shared symbolic meanings, therefore, that we can adequately interpret the intentions of other people. For example, when I say "hello" to my neighbor, it is with the intention that I acknowledge that I have seen her and wish to communicate neighborliness, and with the expectation that she will similarly acknowledge and communicate.

A breakdown of the symbolic process of interaction in groups is one of the major "problematic" experiences of juvenile delinquents. The ability to cooperate is extremely important for young people as they interact with others in their family, their school, recreation and work groups. The shared meanings of the intentions are important in school where the symbolic meanings often are not mutually shared by young people and adult teachers. Cooperation is much easier when both actors in the situation understand the intentions of the actions of the other person. The breakdown of these symbolic processes often result from differences of social status and ethnic or racial background of the persons interacting. A better understanding of each others' symbolic worlds can enhance the chances of cooperation within and between social groups.

Symbolic language not only is essential to social behavior in groups, but is the key to the development of self. The self is developed through interaction with other people and the symbolic definitions they give us about who we are.[16] The process of learning these meanings and definitions, and being accepted by others is called socialization. Without a clear definition of self, a person cannot be adequately socialized into the family or other social groups.

According to Mead, the self is a process involving the "I" and the "Me." The "I" is the impulsive, spontaneous, unorganized aspect of our experiences. The "Me" is the organized attitudes, definitions, and expectations. The "I" and the "Me" collaborate to provide balance for the self.[17] When the regulatory aspects of the "Me" are not strong enough to balance the propulsive aspect of the "I," a person is likely to behave in a way that is considered inappropriate by people in the broader society (e.g., delinquent or deviant).

The self comes from three developmental stages. The *preparatory* stage is one of meaningless imitations, such as young children pretending to read a newspaper. The *play* stage involves actually playing the roles of others; for example, a girl playing the role of her mother in a game of "house." The *game* stage is when a person is in a situation where he or she must take a number of roles simultaneously.[18] Consider the example of a baseball team where each person on that team must know what every other person is going to do in the event there is a pop-fly to the shortstop with the bases loaded. Each person knows what he must do and has expectations and information about what each person on his team will be doing.

A clear sense of identity comes from the development of a well-formed self. Cooley described this process by the descriptive phrase--"the looking-glass self;" one's identity emerges out of the reactions of others to a person's behavior. A person's identity comes from interactions with other persons and the incorporation of the symbolic definitions and meanings which help to achieve a view of the generalized other. The generalized other is the collection of viewpoints that are common to the group and broader society where the person is living, and can be found in the schools or churches, for example.

The family is the social group that provides primary socialization to young people. If the family is disorganized, there is a chance that the development of self will be incomplete and the definitions of the community and society will not be incorporated into the "Me" which regulates behavior. Secondary socialization usually comes from the schools. It is in the school context that young people can develop from the play stage to an effective game stage to learn the viewpoints of the various groups in our society. Another critical aspect of self relates to mental illness. When the "I" dominates the "Me," there is an imbalance that often causes mental illness.

A person becomes aware of the self when he or she can take the role of the other person. "Role, then, may be defined as a typified response to a typified situation."[19] The role provides the pattern of expected behavior in a specific situation. The role not only patterns our behavior, but is also bestows the identity which each person acquires.[20] In addition to learning our own roles, it is important to be able "to take the role of the other" in order to acquire the meanings and expectations that are essential to life without conflict in the social group.[21]

The social role provides a pattern or model which guides each person's actions in a specific situation. If the role process is not learned, there are increased chances that a person's behavior will be unacceptable to others. In the context of social groups, such as families, roles are learned and practiced by children. Identity, then, is socially bestowed, socially sustained, and socially transformed by social roles which the individual experiences in specific social groups.

Social values are learned first from "significant others" who are important to our primary socialization. This learning is reinforced by "generalized orders" who also expand the repertoire of roles expected of each person.[22] Significant others are usually members of our family or peer groups. Generalized others are often discovered in school, church or television.

Another way we learn the values, meanings and expectations of our society is from the "reference group." "A reference group . . . is the collectivity whose opinions, convictions and courses of actions are decisive for the formulations of our own opinions, convictions and courses of action."[23] The reference group gives us a model with which to compare ourselves, and it gives us a particular slant on social reality. So the choice of and availability of proper reference groups are important to young people who may select a deviant or socially unacceptable reference group.

A final contribution of symbolic interactionism perspective is " . . . that social problems are fundamentally products of a process of collective definitions instead of existing independently as a set of objective social arrangements with an intrinsic makeup."[24] Collective definitions come from the beliefs, values, and actions of the society at large as they relate to such social problems as juvenile delinquency. This is counter to the typical approach to social problems which views the problem as an objective condition of the society.

The process of collective definition involves five stages determining the career and fate of social problems from the beginning to some terminal point. These stages are: (1) the emergence of the social problem; (2) the legitimizing of the problem; (3) the mobilization of action; (4) the formation of an official plan of action; and (5) the implementation of the official plan.[25]

If we trace juvenile delinquency through these five stages, we find that the collective definition is (1) society becomes aware that certain behavior of young people is not acceptable; (2) juvenile delinquent behavior must be endorsed as a legitimate social problem; (3) the problem then becomes the center of discussion for various forms of social action; (4) an official plan often is proposed by officials or legislative bodies; and (5) the official plan usually will be implemented by administrative personnel after substitutions and adjustments to the official plan of action which is to affect the problem.

Whether or not a particular problem is collectively defined depends on how successfully it evolves from one stage to the next. Not all social problems have successful careers in terms of a collective definition. The time, location, and career success of juvenile delinquency has varied during the past and present. The concept of the collective definition implies that each of us in the society affects the recognition and outcome of each social problem.

## Policy Implications for Delinquency Prevention

The policy recommendations listed below are a limited number which may be drawn from the theories presented.

1. Do what is necessary to help families stay together in cooperative and supportive units. This might include family counseling and parent training.
2. Establish mental health centers to serve youth and families in need of support.
3. Provide recreational, artistic, musical and crafts opportunities to youth.
4. Reorient schools to provide the services, skill and opportunities necessary to develop positive identities among the youth.
5. Regulate television programming to support delinquency prevention objectives.
6. Reconsider how religion may play a significant role in delinquency prevention.

The Family--All the psychological theories which we reviewed point to the family as a critical determinant in child development. There is agreement that the child receives primary socialization in this setting and additional values and patterns of behavior are learned from the outside world. In terms of prevention, attention must be given to issues that some might consider to be private and untouchable. There are many aspects of family life which we generally regard as private matters such as patterns of authority or styles of parenting, but the psychological theories presented lead one to believe that educational and therapeutic services for families should be available, and that many youngsters and parents might benefit from these services.

Parent Training--The theories indicate that possibly the most important aspect of childhood is the emergence of good self-images, feelings of personal worth. This development is dependent upon the fulfillment of certain biological, psychological and social needs of the child. The area of biological needs include such things as good diet and nutrition, medical care, immunizations, dental care and hygiene. Feelings of being loved and cared for, acceptance of one's self, and development of internal discipline could constitute some of the psychological needs. Social requisites include being able to get along with others, developing friendships and other relationships, acquiring skills and abilities.

Everyday experience shows that most adults come to parenthood with no conception of the meaning of being a parent and they possess little of the information that is required to adequately perform this function. A problem for some parents may be not knowing how to get this information or being ashamed to ask for help. Many people essentially imitate their own upbringing and have little conception of alternative methods of rearing children. Those parents relying only on their own memories of childhood may be the ones who have the most difficulty in raising children. Oftentimes parents are unaware of how they may be contributing to the problems of their children. Parents often do not consider what kinds of persons they would like their children to become and what factors might contribute towards influencing their child to progress in that direction.

Teaching parents to be better parents would essentially be an educational program dealing with all aspects of child development and parenting. Such a program could focus first on the stages of child development, reasonable behavioral expectations of children at various stages (e.g., the vast majority of three-year-olds cannot sit sill for an hour), medical needs, hygiene and so on. Information about the influence of modeling and reinforcement and the many ways in which it can be used (sometimes inadvertently and contrary to the way the parent desires) could be presented in uncomplicated and useable form. Various styles of parenting (e.g., authoritarian, democratic, permissive) could be explored without value judgments as to one being better than the other, but stressing that parents use what style is most comfortable for them. Feelings of frustration and hostility towards one's children could be openly and candidly discussed.

In addition, resources available to parents could be presented, for example, parental-stress services, child care programs, preschool experiences, classes for children such as swimming, crafts and sports offered through the city governments and school districts.

Much more could be offered to parents in such an educational program. The program should, of course, be relevant to the particular community in which it is located and place emphasis on the particular needs of that community--for example, bilingual classes should be offered where large numbers of persons' first language is other than English.

Family Counseling--The discussion of the psychological theories in the paper should indicate the complexity and difficulty involved in the socialization process. Much of the problematic nature of socialization occurs within the family context. Day-to-day experiences of family life present many conflicts and tensions to family members. In addition, external factors can further the strains of family life, such as loss of employment, a job promotion, a death in the family or bad grades in school. These external pressures add to intra-family strains such as illness or parental conflicts. Whether because of day-to-day problems or specific crises, difficult family situations often can be improved by counseling or therapy. If difficulties are not resolved, family members may carry their frustration and anger and translate it into antisocial behavior. For example, a young child, in the midst of feelings of anger, throws a rock and breaks a window; the misbehavior might result in a police contact which might lead to further tensions and strains among family members. Conflicts and tensions might be temporarily suppressed and family members could internalize these emotions, but psychoanalytic theory suggest that problems may crop up again, possibly resulting in serious antisocial behavior.

Mental Health Services--Psychoanalytic theory views delinquency and mental illness emerging from unresolved mental conflicts during early childhood. Following this logic, there is a need to deal with emotional conflicts and tensions before they result in criminal or other antisocial behavior. Freudian theory indicates that people get locked into patterns of behavior which do not necessarily deal with the real conflicts and problems. In a family, a person's emotional problems can very easily create tensions and emotional conflicts for others living with them. For example, a parent's problem can be interpreted to mean personal rejection for a child and create feelings of inadequacy and further perpetuate emotional problems into the next generation.

Traditional psychoanalytic procedures do not necessarily have to be the mode of operation in mental health services. Other forms of therapy or counseling may be more effective; for example, role-playing or behavior modification techniques may be useful with persons who have difficulty verbalizing or are in a setting where the first language is not English.

The costs of private psychiatric services is prohibitively high for most people. Those who can afford psychotherapy generally are the ones who have many other resources to deal with personal problems. Those under more restrictive stresses from social and economic conditions which can contribute to emotional problems do not have such ready access to mental health services. If it is assumed that emotional problems can lead to delinquency, an important component of prevention becomes adequate mental health services for the general population at nominal fees or free of charge.

An additional component of mental health programs should be widespread education regarding therapeutic services. A still commonly held view is that anyone who needs mental health services is "crazy." Information to dispell this notion and other stereotype of mental illness is paramount to the success of mental health services.

Recreational, Artistic, Musical Opportunities--According to the theories presented, opportunities to develop skills and talents may play an important role in preventing delinquency. Erikson indicates acquiring skills and producing things in childhood helps a child to learn his or her relation to the world at large and eventually helps in developing a sense of identity. And a strong sense of identity is more likely to result in law-abiding behavior. Learning theory would emphasize the introduction of new potential models for children to emulate by observing and participating in these activities. In addition, participation and development of such activities brings positive reinforcement of a social nature. Not only role models but the possibility of using athletes, artists, craftspeople and musicians as a personal reference group would be emphasized by symbolic interactionist theories of delinquency prevention.

Unfortunately, recreational, artistic and musical opportunities have generally been unavailable to those without the financial resources to pay for them. By making these activities more readily available to the total population, communities may be taking a major step towards delinquency prevention.

The Schools--The psychological theories point to the schools as an important influence in the lives of children. School learning levels correspond to and play active parts in critical stages of development in Erikson's and Mead's theories. Schools are important places for reinforcement and modeling to occur, according to social learning theories.

Schools are expected to meet a variety of functional needs in our society. Most generally, they are intended to provide basic skills and secondary socialization for young people in our society. Teaching basic skills whether academic or vocational is the function of schools with which most people can agree. With the basic language and numeric skills, young people are better able to survive in our society. These are necessary skills for employment and personal management to receive services. Vocational skills sometimes are considered of low priority in schools, but young people with vocational kills are able to survive in our industrialized society with greater ease than without these skills.

In addition to skill development, teachers and schools must be sensitized to the secondary socialization process to which they consciously and unconsciously contribute. Schools play a crucial part in the development of a child's sense of identity and sense of self-worth. School personnel impart social values, directing children toward reference groups, and develop some of the skills of cooperative social behavior. All of these social psychological processes occur as the basic skills are being taught.

The modeling effects of teachers and the curriculum taught in schools need to be analyzed. Special programs such as survival education (e.g., how to protect yourself as a consumer), multicultural curriculum, and teachers and aides of many ethnic backgrounds can help enhance the processes mentioned above. It is critical that schools recognize their socialization function as well as teaching the basic skills--reading, writing and arithmetic.

Television--The effects of modeling can be considerable. This was demonstrated by the Bandura studies. One of the powerful modeling influences, particularly for young children, is television.

While learning theorists have dealt specifically with the effects of television, other psychological theorists would also agree on the influence of television on children. Erikson's stage of industry versus inferiority includes not only the acquisition of skills but an assessment of one's status in the world and how one fits into the structure of the society. Research indicates that television is an important way of acquiring this information. Given the current programming, television may be telling large proportions of the child population that there is no legitimate place for them. For example, most of the people depicted on television are white males; women are usually portrayed usually in the roles of wives or girl friends and too rarely as people in their own right.

Symbolic interactionism, too, would indicate the importance of television as being part of the "generalized other." In other words, television is seen as a reflection of the generalized society's values on which children base their values.

A study of adult television viewers indicates that intensive television watching tends to distort one's perception of the real world.[26] The distortion was explained by the kinds of programming which showed three-quarters of the characters white male almost one-fifth of the programs have violent themes; and the relative sameness of the life-styles and types of interactions which were depicted on television programs. Often violence is portrayed as an acceptable method of conflict resolution. Socially constructive and realizable models for working through hostility or conflict are not often presented.

Violence as an influence on young children has been a concern of many people. Some have advocated prohibiting all violence on television and strict control of programming. Whether such a ban on violence would reduce delinquency is problematic. It should be noted that a ban of cigarette advertising on television in force for the past few years has not noticeably decreased the proportion of young people smoking in this country, although this example is not clear-cut because of the other forces at work.

The impact of television as a means of instilling values and a particular view of the world has not been systematically measured at this point, but everyday experiences indicate that it is considerable. We see the pervasive impact of television on children in everyday life. Rather than singing folk songs, children sing the MacDonald's theme song or an advertisement for Bumblebee Tuna. Children make up games based on the program "S.W.A.T."

The education quality of television should be exploited in positive rather than destructive directions. Possibly the most expedient method of dealing with television is to open it up. Television has been criticized not only for the violence issue, but for solely middle-class orientation of many programs, stereotypic view of minority peoples, a division of the world into "good guys" and "bad guys."

The diversity of role models available in this society could be greatly facilitated by television. This could be done by realistic portrayal of minorities, women, occupations, and all the various positions which people occupy in this country. Television could show the diversity in life-styles and family styles. Programs should show different and realistic modes of interaction among family members besides submission, shouting or violence. By widening the range of models which are presented on television, the effects of what violence is shown may possibly be minimized.

Religion--There are basically two contributions of religion as a social institution to delinquency prevention. One involves the structure of the church as a social organization. The other involves the source of social values that are considered normative in our society.

Churches can provide an excellent place for the learning of cooperative social behavior in the youth groups. The activities of church youth groups provide interaction, planning and behavioral skills that help to build strong identities and self-awareness for young people. Religious institutions also provide one of the few social situations where young people can interact with adults of various ages. Interactions with a diverse age group can strengthen an awareness of the generalized other defined by Mead.

Religion as a source of social and moral values seems to be important to an increasing number of young people today. The secular society of our everyday world often does not provide guidelines for personal, social and moral values in the same way that religion can. Through their participation in religious groups, young people can identify with reference groups that encourage behavior and values that are acceptable to the local community and the larger society.

References:

[1] For a more complete discussion of Freud, see Melvin H. Marx and William Hillix, Systems and Theories in Psychology, New York, San Francisco, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963, pp. 201-240, and Sigmund Freud, A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis (trans. by Joan Riviere), New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1962.

[2] Seymour L. Halleck, Psychiatry and the Dilemmas of Crime. New York: Harper and Row, 1967: 59.

[3] Erik Erikson, Childhood and Society. New York: W.W. Norton, Inc., 1963: 246.

[4] Ibid: 261.

[5] Ibid: 259.

[6] Ibid: 271.

[7] Dollard J. and Miller, N.W. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950 and Mowrer, O.H., Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics. New York: Ronald, 1950, are examples.

[8] Krech, David and Richard S. Crutchfield. Elements of Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958: 402.

[9] Bandura, Albert and Richard H. Walters. Social Learning and Personality, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc: 25.

[10] Bandura, A.; Ross, Dorothea; and Ross, Shiela A. "Imitations of Film-Mediated Aggressive Models," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1963, 66: 3-11.

[11] Bandura, Albert and Walters, Richard H. Social Learning and Personality Development, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.: 179.

[12] Ibid: 212.

[13] Ibid: 213.

[14] Manis, Jerome G. and Meltzer, Bernard N. (eds.). Symbolic Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967: 1-2.

[15] Meltzer, Bernard N. "Mead's Social Psychology," Symbolic Interaction, Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer (eds.), Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1967: 7.

[16] Manis & Meltzer; op. cit.: 9-10.

[17] Ibid: 11-12.

[18] Ibid: 10-11.

[19] Berger, Peter L. Invitation to Sociology. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963: 98.

[20] Ibid: 98.

[21] Ibid: 99.

[22] Ibid: 98-99.

[23] Ibid: 118.

[24] Blumer, Herbert. "Social Problems as Collective Behavior," Social Problems, 18 (Winter, 1971): 298.

[25] Ibid: 301.

[26] Gerbner, George and Grose, Larry. "The Scary World of Television's Heavy Viewer," Psychology Today, April 1976: 41-45, 89.

Bibliography:

1. Bandura, Albert and Menlove, Frances L. "Factors Determining Vicarious Extinction of Avoidance Behavior Through Symbolic Modeling," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 8, No. 2, 99-108 (1968).

2. Bandura, A.; Ross, Dorothea; and Ross, Shiela A. "Imitations of Film-Mediated Aggressive Models," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1963, 66: 3-11.

3. Bandura, Albert and Walters, Richard H. Social Learning and Personality Development, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.

4. Berger, Peter L. Invitation to Sociology. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1963.

5. Blumer, Herbert. "Social Problems as Collective Behavior," Social Problems, 18 (Winter, 1971): 298-306.

6. Dollard J. and Miller, N.E. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.

7. Dorr, Darwin and Fey, Steven. "Relative Power of Symbolic Adult and Peer Models in the Modification of Children's Moral Choice Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 29, No. 3, 335-341.

8. Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. New York: W.W. Norton, Inc., 1963.

9. Fenichel, Otto. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1945.

10. Freud, Sigmund. A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis (trans. by Joan Riviere). New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1962.

11. Gerbner, George and Grose, Larry. "The Scary World of Television's Heavy Viewer," Psychology Today, April 1976: 41-45, 89.

12. Halleck, Seymour L. Psychiatry and the Dilemmas of Crime. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

13. Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard S. Elements of Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.

14. Maccoby, Eleanor E.; Newcomb, Theodore M.; and Hartly, Eugene. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.

15. Manis, Jerome G. and Meltzer, Bernard N. (eds). Symbolic Interaction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

16. Marx, Melvin H. and Hillix, William. Systems and Theories in Psychology. New York, San Francisco, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

17. Meltzer, Bernard N. "Mead's Social Psychology," Symbolic Interaction, Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer (eds.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

18. Mowrer, O.H. Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics. New York: Ronald, 1950.

19. Mowrer, O. Hobart. Learning Theory and Behavior. New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.

20. Reckless, Walter C.; Dinitz, Simon and Murray, Ellen. "Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 21, 6 (Dec. 1956): 744-746.

21. Strauss, Anselm. The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

## IV - THE BIOLOGICAL BASES OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

The relationship between biological constitution and behavior has been asserted and denied at various stages during the relatively short life of sociological and, in particular, criminological investigation. The early work of Lombroso, Goring, Goddard and Hooten, while interesting in a historical sense, is over-simplified and too reductionistic to yield valid and useful insights when the levels of sophistication of recent research in this area are considered. In fact it has been the work of only the last five to ten years in the disciplines of genetics, biochemistry, neurophysiology and endocrinology which permits discussions of the bearing of biological factors on behavior to be taken seriously.

Nonetheless, it is crucially important to recognize that the position taken by most researchers on the biological-environmental (nature-nurture) continuum is strongly influenced by their ideological perspective. Sociologists have traditionally looked to environmental and social variables for "cases" of observed behavior. This position when driven to its ultimate realization generates the kind of behaviorism or environmental determinism that one associates with the well-known theories of J. B. Watson. However, in theoretical models of even minimal acceptance of environmental determinism one may propose that behavior is influenced and personalities are at least partially shaped by the social environment. Adherents of liberalism and of the desirability of the welfare state find themselves quite at home with this "sociological" view of behavior formation.

On the other hand, biological determinism with its assertion of the independence of behavior from the influence of environment and social interaction forever stamps each individual with the curse (or blessing) of behavioral invariance and fatalism. This perspective would have behavior as capable of being changed only through the mechanisms of biological restructuring; through genetic engineering, surgical modification or chemical treatment.

Of course one need not be forced into a polar position with regard to these basic theoretical orientations about the formation of human behavior. Indeed recent work does not radiate the hysterical one-sided assertions of biological or environmental determinism. Money in his "Behavior Genetics . . ." acknowledges

> Whatever the type of heredity mechanism the essential idea in the mind of either the lawman or the professional, when he deals with heredity, is the idea of that which is somehow fixed and beyond his control. It goes variously by the name of the constitutional, innate, physical, congenital and, of course, genetic. All these concepts are subject to severe limitation. The idea behind them all is that they point to something which is nativistic, as compared with environmentalistic. A rigid dichotomy between these two is untenable . . . . The real need is for a concept of interactionism.[1]

Baka in "Chromosome Error and Antisocial Behavior" states:

> There is a parallelism between the philosophical concepts: free will vs. determinism; the biomedical concepts: genetic vs. environmental, the body-mind dichotomy and the organic functional (brain-mind) dichotomy. In the past, there has been a tendency to adopt an either/or approach toward these matters with proponents of each argument being quite vehement and arbitrarily excluding the viewpoint of their opponents. In recent years, however, there has been increased acceptance of the concept of a continuum of relationships between these polar factors, resulting in a spectrum of variation with, on the one hand, those situations in which the outcome may be determined by purely genetic factors, and, on the other hand, those situations which depend entirely on the environment. In between, however, are many clinical examples of combined genetic and environmental interaction.[2]

Shah has summarized the problems that social scientists have in accepting biological, particularly genetic, explanations of behavior:

1. A democratic political ideology tends to confuse political and legal equality. However as Dobzhansky has pointed out, "The mighty vision of human equality belongs to the realms of ethics and politics, not that of biology. To be equal before the law people need not be identical twins."

2. There seems to be some apprehension that the moral and legal concepts of individual responsibility and free will might seriously be eroded once determination by hereditary forces is admitted in respect to personal conduct, especially criminal behavior.

3. Related to the above, there appears also to be the view that acceptance of hereditary factors in regard to mental disorders would lead inevitably to "therapeutic nihilism." Such a view clearly is based on the simplistic and erroneous notion that behavioral problems related to genetic factors are always untreatable, while environmentally determined problems are amenable to treatment and remediation.

4. The criticism is often expressed that the evidence for heritability of behavior cannot be considered to be conclusive until the physiologic basis of the effect has been demonstrated. While such a demonstration is indeed desirable and research is proceeding in this direction, the complexities of tracing the pathways from gene to behavior are considerable. However, the nature and degree of etiologic specification and demonstration of relationships required of behavior genetics, as compared for example to the nature of the evidence for various psychologic and sociologic theories, suggests that the . . . /a/ "double standard" may also be involved.

5. Finally, consideration of hereditary and environmental influences on human behavior within a single conceptual framework is a most difficult and demanding undertaking and requires a wide range of knowledge. Thus, psychiatric geneticists, as well as behavioral and social scientists adhering to an environmentalist view, have found it easier to pay lip-service to other contributions without undertaking the difficult task of conceptualizing and integrating different sets of contributions.[3]

We may accept the fact of interaction between constitution and environment, and we may also accept Shah's exposition of the social scientist's rationale for his reluctance to incorporate evidence of the biological influences on behavior into his theories. However, we also must be aware that biological constitution, in general, presents the organism with a behavioral potential, not a realization. The multiplicity of environments may shape and modify an individual's behavioral responses in a multitude of ways. That is not to say that structural organismic characteristics do not delimit these behavioral responses. In fact, these genetic and physical "givens" do bear upon patterns of behavior conjointly with the social and physical environments. But we do take the position here that the overall behavioral uniformities existent in any cultural area, given genetic diversity also existent in that area, are strong evidence of the primal influence of environment on behavior.

No behavior is per se criminal. In any given spatial and temporal locus certain kinds of actions are deemed improper and are therefore unacceptable. In the United States, at this time, there exist sanctions against a wide variety of behaviors called "criminal." These behaviors range from very simple violations of local ordinances to severe forms of property loss and bodily damage. However, none of these proscribed actions is solely caused by biological factors; rather, the propensity for such activity which is at a particular time and place deemed illegal by the controlling agencies may very well be constitutional in the individual. It is the interaction of this biological structure with the environment under a set of relevant proscriptions that permits a discussion of the relationship between biology and crime. In no way can we consider criminal behavior a product of some biological imperative. In fact, as we shall point out in the following discussion, very little of the "crime problem" is composed of behavior related to biological factors. The dramatic escalation in the volume and severity of crime in the United States during the last ten years has not been accompanied by a concomitant shift in the biological composition of the population.[4]

In addition, one must consider the costs of accepting a causative theory of behavior as a basis for social policy when that theory may, in fact, be incorrect. In statistical terms, the rejection of the null hypothesis (that the variables under investigation are not related to or do not cause some observed behavior) should be made more or less difficult depending upon the social costs of making an erroneous decision. We would need much stronger evidence to base social action on a theory that could have grievous effects if it were false than we would if the implementation of that theory had little or no deleterious effect (and, of course, no positive results either). Conversely, we may be more sanguine about social experimentation in areas where the possible benefits are great and the risks of causing damage are relatively minimal. Therefore, we shall not recommend an action policy based on a biological theory of behavior unless empirical tests have been undertaken, the methodologies of these tests or experiments are adequate and replications of those empirical supports indicate a high degree of reliability. Such conclusive documentation is rare in the social science and just as unlikely to be found when biological factors are added in the attempt to explain behavior.

With the above discussion in mind we may now consider the various subject areas which have been researched and examine the results of the published documentation.[5] Shah in his complete review of the literature in this subject domain has classified the studies into the following biological variables.[6]

1. Tumors and atrophic or other destructive or inflammatory processes of the limbic system, which result in marked behavioral abnormality.

2. The continuum of cases beginning with frank and clinically apparent epileptic seizures, and extending from these ictal events (i.e., behaviors occurring during a seizure) to post-ictal confusion or automatisms, inter-ictal (between seizures) outbursts or episodic behaviors, electroencephalogram abnormalities themselves (with or without a history of seizure disorders), the controversial subject of certain peculiarities exhibited by temporal lobe epileptics, and episodic behavior disorders with no other evidence of seizures.

3. Endocrine abnormalities, especially those where levels of testosterone (the "male" hormone) or progesterone and estrogene ("female" hormones) appear to be correlated with behavior, and hypoglycemic disorders.

4. Perinatal birth complications shown to have a strong socioeconomic class correlation which seems to parallel that of the distribution of officially labeled criminality and delinquency.

5. Minimal brain dysfunction in children and adolescents, especially as this relates to EEG and other neurological abnormalities, hyperkinesis, reading disorders, and related behavioral characteristics that tend to increase the probability of future identification of such individuals as delinquent.

6. Genetic research pertaining to possible heritable components in personality and psychopathic disorders.

7. The possible relationship between certain chromosomal abnormalities (47, XXY and 47, XXY, or Klinefelter's syndrome) and antisocial, aggressive, or other behaviors likely to be labeled criminal.

8. More recent studies on the association between physique, temperament and behavior.

The first two categories above, that of tumors, other malfunctions of the limbic system and various behavior manifestations or epilepsy are both related to the general area of brain damage and criminal behavior. The limbic system or limbic brain is that structure closely surrounding the brain stem (the nerve tissue which connects the brain to the spinal column and, in part, controls the basic life functions of heartbeat, breathing and sleep) which probably moderates the expression of violence and other emotions such as anger, rage, fear, and sexual response. The limbic region communicates with the highly-developed neocortex and the brain stem and consists of that area which outlines the inner surface of each cerebral hemisphere. It contains the structure of the cirgulum, hippocampus, thalmus, hypothalmus, basal ganglis, the septal nuclei, the undersurface of the frontal lobe, the midbrain and the amygdala.[7]

These areas have been shown to be probably related to the expression of certain types of violent behavior. One advocate for the position that the limbic system is central to violent behavior writes as follows:

> The results of experiments . . . on recording, ablating, and stimulating animal brains seems to indicate clearly that there is a definite neural system which organizes effective and directed attack behavior, and that this system is linked to structures of the limbic brain. The system can be activated by events within the environment, or by artificial stimulation of the limbic brain; and removal or destruction of specific limbic structures leads to predictable behavioral changes especially in regard to the display of fight or flight reactions.[8]

Adequate control mechanisms exist in the normal brain to ensure that spontaneous and unprovoked violence does not occur during the routine of daily life. According to Mark and Ervin such forms of violence follow as a result of either hyperactivity of the limbic system because of a lesion, tumor or stimulation of some sort of the "neocortical inputs have become abnormal."[9]

Sweet, Ervin and Mark in their clinical practice assert that focal brain lesions are possible causes of this violent behavior and that "the application of chronic focal stimulation to the brain may reduce or stop their undesirable actions" (violent behaviors).[10] They list a number of focal cerebral disorders which are often accompanied by aggressive, violent behavior. These include:

a) In the viral encephalitides, rabies in the early stages cause irritability and violent behavior resulting from infection of the temporal lobe.

b) Some documentation exists which indicates that head injuries resulting in damage to the temporal lobe are followed by aggressive behavior.

c) Tumors of the limbic system and the temporal lobe have been shown to be related to aggressive, violent behavior.

d) Outbursts of rage and hostility are sometimes reported to result from temporal lobe epilepsy, although Gloor, as reported in Sweet, Ervin and Mark, states that violence is an extremely rare ictal occurrence. Of 50 patients who received surgery of the temporal lobe only two had impulses which could be called rage-like.[11]

Electrodes implanted in the amygdala of seven psychomotor epileptic patients could not provoke rage or aggressiveness. However, Heath and Mickle did find electrical discharges in the amygdala resembling those exhibited during spontaneous seizures.[12]

Surgical removal of the temporal lobe or the amygdala has not produced uniform behavior modifications. The experience to date indicates that aggressive behavior may or may not be reduced as a result of removing the amygdata or the temporal lobe. However, Mark and Ervin have continued to refine and develop their techniques so that only portions of the amygdala may be destroyed. Thus, the specific behavior manifestation of the lesion or tumor may be treated with greater predictability of the outcome. Because the amygdala affects some 29 different somatic motor and anatomic activities, removal of the whole structure may cause gross and unpredictable behavioral changes.[13] The authors, therefore, have proposed the use of stereotactic equipment to ensure proper placement of the destructive electrodes in the amygdala.[14] Mark and Ervin report favorable outcomes in about 50 percent of the cases where uncontrolled violence and aggression were apparent and they summarize their work as follows:

> . . . there is a significant and growing body of clinical and especially surgical evidence to indicate that the production of small focal areas of destruction in parts of the limbic brain will often eliminate dangerous behavior in assaultive and violent patients. That this therapeutic effect is not always obtained may be explained in some patients by the pressure of brain disease in control structures (e.g., the mid-brain) that are not controlled directly by the amygdala. In addition there are competing systems in the limbic brain that both imitate and stop violent behavior. As surgeons we are only beginning to recognize the subtleties of this complex region.[15]

However, there is no consensus in the literature that psychomotor epilepsy and aggressive behavior are related. For example, Rodin in 1973 reported:

> The literature states that patients with psychomotor epilepsy are prone to aggressive acting-out behavior. Of 150 epileptic patients whose seizures were photographed, 42 had ictal psychomotor automatisms and 15 had postictal psychomotor attacks. There was no instance of ictal or postictal aggression in this study. When there was danger of aggressive behavior, it would promptly be averted by abandoning restraint efforts.

> To define the characteristics of the aggression prone individual, 700 charts were reviewed; 34 patients were found who had committed aggressive acts. The profile of the aggression-prone individual which emerged was that of a young man of lower-than-average intelligence with a history of behavioral difficulties dating back to school age and who did not have strong religious ties. Presence or absence of psychomotor epilepsy was not a relevant variable.[16]

Ounsted in his study of 100 children with temporal lobe epilepsy, 35 of which had brain trauma or infection associated with the onset of the disease, found no relationship among the frequencies of temporal lobe attacks, grand mal attacks and rage outbursts.

> It has been argued elsewhere that to call a behavior pattern "pathological" is biological nonsense. There are only unusual frequencies, unusual intensities and deployments at unusual points in the ontogeny. The rages which the children with temporal lobe epilepsy show are similar in form to those of normal infants . . . . . It is the occurrence of these rates at the wrong age, under slight provocation and in the wrong social setting, which marks them, in our eyes, as pathological.
>
> Two-thirds of our sample had no rage outbursts in spite of much social disorder, apartheid schooling difficulties, low intelligence and lack of useful occupation. Thus, it is unlikely that any simple relationship will be found between the temporal ictus and rage outbursts.[17]

Alstrom studied the relationship between epilepsy and criminality and reported that epilepsy is unrelated to criminality.

> In a modern textbook of neurology published in 1946 we read that the impulsive equivalents in epileptics "have many crimes to their account" such as "arson, unmotivated homicide, theft and exhibitionism." This gloomy view of the criminality of epileptics by no means conforms with the conditions that have been found to obtain in the present investigation . . . . The correspondence with the figures for the general population is good: at any rate there can be no decisive difference between this group and the general population in regard to criminality.[18]

And finally, Livingston states:

> . . . I find no evidence of a higher rate of criminal activity among epileptics than among nonepileptics. Based on my 27 years of specializing in the treatment, study, and contact with the course of living of some 15,000 epileptic patients on every social level, I can state positively that the incidence of crimes committed by these patients was no greater than--even showed no difference from--that in a similar number of nonepileptics.[19]

So far we have shown that violent behavior is sometimes related to malfunctions of the temporal lobe or the amygdala and that focal destruction of tissue in these structures may have an aggressiveness reducing effect. The relationship between temporal lobe epilepsy and violent, criminal behavior is even less certain. However, an extensive literature dating back to the 1930's attempts to relate violent behavior to abnormal EEG readings. In these studies, of which we shall review only a few, the cause of the aberrant brain wave pattern is not usually determined. Rather, the subjects were assessed by this technique because they had already been diagnosed as having some brain malfunction or damage which ostensibly caused some abnormal, usually psychopathic, behavior pattern. The cause and, therefore, the treatment for EEG abnormalities are not always explicit. These studies do not permit valid conclusions as to the relationship between an observed EEG pattern and an observed behavior. Also the variability in reading and interpreting the results of an EEG, the fact that the numerous studies rarely were conducted in comparable manners and that controls were rarely utilized do not offer very secure ground for drawing conclusions. Nonetheless, we shall note below the conclusions of some of these studies to sensitize the reader to the nature of the work.

Few studies have dealt exclusively with homicide and EEG abnormality. Stafford-Clark and Taylor, Hill and Pond, Mundy-Castle, Winkler and Kove and Sayed, Lewis and Brittain have all reported incidences of EEG abnormalities which were elevated for murderers when when compared to the non-criminal, non-psychiatrically ill population.[20] Stafford-Clark and Taylor conclude:

> A clinical and electro-encephalographic study of sixty-four prisoners charged with murder suggests that a significant correlation exists between apparently motiveless crime and electroencephalographic abnormality. While this abnormality is not specific, it has been found in over 70 per cent of prisoners whose crimes appeared motiveless but also were otherwise clinically sane and normal.[21]

Sayed, Lewis and Brittain, using a somewhat improved methodology, in that controls were used and the EEG interpreters were not aware whether the record came from a control or experimental subject, reached conclusions similar to those noted above:

> An EEG and psychiatric study was carried out on thirty-two murderers classified legally as insane. Their EEG's which were read "blind" were compared with a control (non-patient) group and it was found that the patients had an incidence of EEG abnormality about four times that of the control group. The study confirmed the general finding that approximately half the psychopaths had abnormal EEG's but the psychotic group had a much higher incidence of EEG abnormalities.[22]

Small, in her study of 100 felons, found no statisically significant relationships between EEG abnormality and the clinical diagnosis of sociopathic disorders, schizophrenia, organic brain syndrome, mental deficiency, undiagnosed psychiatric illness and criminal behavior.

> A high incidence of mental illness, electroencephalographic (EEG) abnormalities, and indications of central nervous system (CNS) impairment was observed in a group of 100 felons referred by the courts for psychiatric evaluation. No significant correlations were demonstrated between the psychiatric diagnoses, EEG findings, or results of other individual examinations, and specific aspects of criminal behavior. Moreover, controlled comparisons of prisoners with and without the EEG manifestations described in the literature as typical of criminals, revealed no important clinical or forensic differences.[23]

Ellingson in his rather complete critique of the literature extant in 1955 came to the following conclusions which, in our opinion, still apply today:

> A significant association between EEG abnormality and a disease entity, may, in the opinion of the writer, be considered to exist only if well-controlled studies from more than one center have consistently shown statistically significant EEG differences between groups of patients displaying the given disease and normal controls. If these conditions are not met, or if there is a substantial body of conflicting data, judgment must be deferred. Following these principles, it is felt that only the following generalizations are justified by the literature reviewed.

1) Both consistent and significantly high rates (about 50%) of EEG abnormality have been found in only one diagnostic group, psychopaths

2) Rates of EEG abnormality among behavior problem children are consistently high but markedly variable, probably because of variability of sampling, contamination of patient groups with organic cases, and uncertainty of criteria of EEG abnormality in the lower age groups.

3) Rates of EEG abnormality among schizophrenics are significantly high--probably 1/5 to 1/3--but variable.

4) Reported data on other psychotic groups are insufficient to permit valid generalizations.

5) Data on psychoneurotics are conflicting and therefore inconclusive. At present the weight of evidence seems to indicate that the rate of abnormality in this group is not higher than that found among controls.

6) There is no demonstrated correlation between type or severity of EEG abnormality and type or severity of mental illness within the categories discussed,

7) No specific symptom (except, tentatively, aggressiveness) has been demonstrated to be consistently associated with EEG abnormality within the categories discussed.

8) There is a moderate negative relationship between age and EEG abnormality in mental illness, which is especially evident in the behavior problem and psychopathic groups. Such an age relationship is also evident among normals and epileptics.[24]

Thus, we must conclude that the results of studies of EEG abnormalities and aggressive behavior, while indicating some relationship, must remain, for the most part, inconclusive. Williams in his sophisticated recent research concludes that "the prime disorder of function . . . is in the diencephalic and mesencephalic components of the reticular activating or 'limbic' mechanisms, which have their densest projections to the anterior temporal and frontal cortex" instead of the neocortex itself.[25] In finding three times the EEG abnormalities in habitual violent offenders as in single violent offenders, Williams concluded that the cerebral physiology may be relevant for the former type of offender and the environmental situations for the latter. Thus, he makes the distinction between the brain-damaged and the nonbrain-damaged violent offender on the basis of the persistence of unprovoked aggressive behavior and the EEG configuration.

In summary, there is some evidence, although far less substantial than we would prefer, that certain lesions of the temporal lobe or amygdala do contribute to or cause unprovoked assaultive behavior, that these brain malfunctions can sometimes be recognized by an abnormal EEG and that in certain cases small focal areas of destruction may reduce or eliminate the undesired behavior.

In discussing the third of the areas of biological concern for criminal behavior as outlined by Shah and quoted earlier in this paper--that of the relevance of the endocrine hormones--we may state that males are generally more aggressive than females and that aggressiveness declines when the level of androgen is reduced. However, in human beings the social milieu contributes strongly to masculine-feminine identification.

Certain relationships between the levels of testosterone and aggressiveness have been shown to exist in the research of Kolodny, Masters, Hendryx and Toro, using homosexual males.[26] Whether this sample is an adequate one for generalization is open to question.

Estrogen reduces the sex drive of males, as reported by Golla and Hodge.[27] The use of the female hormone in this instance resulted in the reduction of libido in 13 sex offenders. The researchers recommended that:

> In view of the non-mutilating nature (as opposed to castration) of this treatment and the ease with which it can be administered to a consenting patient we believe it should be adopted whenever possible in male cases of abnormal and uncontrollable sex urge.[28]

In addition Shah reports that Kreuze and Rose "failed to show a difference in testosterone levels between institutionally and noninstitutionally violent male prisoners; however, testosterone levels were related to a prisoner's history of violent crime during adolescence.[29]

Evidence of the bearing of male hormone levels on criminal behavior is, thus, sketchy at best. The "male" traits in our culture of dominance and aggressiveness may be related to hormonal levels, but they are also strongly culturally defined and the interaction between these variables has not been investigated. Therefore, we may not draw conclusions at this time on the nature of this relationship.

Hyperkinesis, learning and reading difficulties, behavioral problems in the school environment, certain EEG and neurological abnormalities are all related to problems subsumed under the general rubric of "minimal brain dysfunction."

> The term 'minimal brain dysfunction' (MBD) is used to designate the medical entity related to the educational term 'learning disabilities' in accordance with the Terminology and Identification Phase of the National Project on Minimal Brain Dysfunction in Children.
>
> The term minimal brain dysfunction covers damage as well as genetic, developmental or other deviations of function. These children generally appear normal but tend to have subclinical deviations of such functions as balance, coordination, visual perception, auditory perception, memory, and so forth, which handicaps their learning unless they have special educational help.[30]

Towbin traces the causes of MBD to a variety of variables such as environmental influences, heredity, nutrition, toxic conditions, endocrine imbalances, and other endogenous and exogenous processes. But a "major portion of cases clinically show evidence of underlying cerebral damage . . . ."[31] In particular Towbin argues that fetal and neonatal central nervous system (CNS) damage is directly related to the syndrome of minimal brain damage. Central nervous system damage takes four main forms: a) subdural hemorrhage due to tears in the venous structure, b) spinal cord and brain stem damage caused by physical injury, c) hypoxic damage (lack of oxygen) to the deep cerebral structures, and d) hypoxic damage to the cerebral cortex.[32] The behavioral results which follow from these various brain traumas range from death of the fetus or death shortly after birth, forms of palsy, epilepsy, mental deficiency and other neurological disturbances.

These brain injuries are typically caused by deprivation, nutritional or hypoxic, in the intrauterine environment or during or shortly after birth. In fact Towbin feels that some hypoxic and mechanical injury to the CNS is a part of all births, no matter how trouble-free and "normal."

Schulte supports Towbin's assertion of the importance of the maintenance of an adequate intrauterine and perinatal environment and extends the concern for adequate brain sustenance into the postnatal period.[33] In fact, he enumerates several factors which may have a bearing on the development of minimal brain dysfunction:

a) certain genetically inherited metabolic peculiarities may be responsible for a lessening of brain function; b) certain types of phenylalaninehydroxylase deficiency and hyperphenylalaninemia cause a reduction in intelligence; c) early malnutrition, early protein deficiency, early postnatal environment, the care, handling and training all have an impact on brain development.

In fact Schulte states: "We know from animal experiments that light, temperature, and alterations in handling can account for the difference between normal and slightly abnormal development and are even correlated with decreased brain weight. In line with these findings, infants of low birth weight who are raised in low socioeconomic status families have a poorer developmental prognosis than undernourished infants raised in upper-middle class families."[34]

We see, in these two papers, the importance that should be placed on the proper care and nutrition of the organism in all phases of fetal development--prenatal, perinatal and postnatal--if brain injuries resulting from the lack of such preventative concern are to be minimized.

Tarnopol in his study of Black and Latin ghetto children found that minimal brain dysfunction is concentrated in this segment of the population. Most of the children had dropped out of school, had severe reading and comprehension deficiencies and had poor visual-motor integration and coordination.

> "All of the test deficiencies noted are parts of the minimal brain dysfunction syndrome which is related to learning disabilities. This cumulative evidence tends to support the hypothesis that a significant degree of minimal brain dysfunction exists in the minority group, delinquent, school dropout population. This evidence may partially explain why the special programs to help educate this population have tended to lack success. A successful program of educational rehabilitation for the minority poor appears to require diagnostic testing and prescriptive teaching starting in preschool."[35]

Two retrospective studies, one by Menkes et al and the other by Litt were undertaken to determine the long-range behavioral development of a group of children who exhibited brain dysfunction or who had been subjected to perinatal complications.[36] [37]

In the Menkes study 18 patients who had been diagnosed as having been hyperactive, with a short attention span, poor coordination, visual motor dysfunction or speech impairment as children were examined 25 years later to determine the extent of persistence of those afflictions. Although signs of some neurological impairment were evident, only three of the subjects still exhibited some symptoms of hyperactivity. Of interest here is the finding that although eight of the individuals had been in a mental institution at one time or another, none was reported to have been incarcerated for criminal behavior. Nor, in fact, was a report of any criminal behavior mentioned.

Litt, whose study was designed to examine the relationship between perinatal complications with their resulting behavioral manifestations of impulsivity, poor motor and self-control and subsequent criminal behavior found, essentially, no relationship in the records of 1976 individuals between the variables of perinatal complications and criminality. Where criminal behavior was found, it tended to be of the type that indicated "poor inhibitary control" or impulsive criminality. Thus Litt concluded:

> Since there was relatively little evidence establishing a relationship between pbcs (pregnancy and birth complications) and the different types of criminality studied, it must be concluded that perinatal complications considered in isolation are not a major etiological factor in general criminal behavior. Criminality marked by poor inhibitory control may be related to delivery complications. With respect to criminal behavior in general, it seems likely that other factors--genetic and environmental--may be more important determinants of social pathology.[38]

Thus one consideration of the literature on minimal brain dysfunction indicates that children so afflicted may present learning and behavior problems in the school environment and they also may exhibit psychomotor disturbances which may cause difficulties in relating to peers. However, there is no evidence that minimal brain dysfunction is related to subsequent delinquent behavior except as may be associated with poor school performance and dropping out of school.

Under the general topical area of genetic factors and criminal behavior, we shall examine the two important domains of the inheritance of the propensity toward criminal behavior and the relationship of chromosomal abnormalities and criminal behavior.

Because "family tree" studies are fraught with methodological errors and weaknesses, the only relatively scientific studies of the inheritance of behavioral propensities are the recent twin studies of which K. O. Christiansen's is perhaps the best.[39] Identical twins share the same genetic constitution, while fraternal twins share only the same environment and age. Thus, if a behavioral or other trait is genetically determined, both identical twins are more likely to exhibit that trait (concordance) than are fraternal twins (discordant). Christiansen found that out of a sample of twins born in Denmark between the years of 1880 and 1910, about 36 percent of the identical twins were concordant for criminal behavior as compared to 12 percent among fraternal twins. Although twin studies have methodological problems still to be addressed such as controls for environmental differences and similarities, differential treatment and criminal labeling of each twin, accurate determination of the zygosity (whether identical or fraternal) of twins, Christiansen's findings do suggest that at the least genetic structure may have some bearing on the display of criminal behavior. However, this research is difficult to undertake and interpret and the drawing of conclusions is risky at best. We shall not deal further with this topic in our exposition because little more is known. We would refer the interested reader to Shah for an extensive review of the studies in this area.[40]

The chromosomal anomalies of 47, XYY and 47, XXY have received attention during the last few years from many researchers investigating the relationships between these genetic malformations and criminal or, at least, antisocial behavior. Although many writers, especially in the popular literature, have spoken of criminal behavior and the chromosomal malformations as though their mutual appearance were a foregone conclusion, evidence for such certainty is not available.

Price and Strong writing in 1966 found seven cases of XYY karyotype out of 197 patients in a mental hospital, all of whom had criminal records. The XYY men were taller than average and their behavior in the hospital had "often been aggressive and violent."[41] Nielsen, et al, in 1968 reported that of the 155 psychologically abnormal criminals in a Danish institution, 42 were over 180 cm. tall, and of these tall men two were XYY's. This percentage is about 25-60 times higher than the general population. The writers concluded: "The figures suggest that the criminal psychopaths over 184 cm. tall should have their chromosomes analyzed because of their substantial risk of having a 47, XYY karyotype; the results of our study show that this risk increases if such patients have committed arson."[42]

Telfer et al in one of the first American studies found five cases of XYY and seven cases of XXY out of 129 tall, institutionalized criminal males. "The results of this limited survey appear to confirm British observations that gross chromosomal errors contribute, in small but consistent numbers, to the pool of antisocial aggressive males who are mentally ill and who become institutionalized for criminal behavior."[43]

R. Housley, after reviewing the findings available in 1969, concluded: "Recently, the presence of an abnormal chromosome make-up has been confirmed. This condition, for reasons not yet clearly established, increases the frequency of abnormal behavior and oftentimes antisocial conduct culminating in crime."[44] Kenneth Burke concludes strongly in his study that:

> Certain persons have been discovered who possess more or less than the normal complement of two sex chromosomes. The probable incidence of males possessing an XYY complement (XY being normal) of sex chromosomes has been estimated at 1:1000 by most authorities. However, a much larger incidence of this complement has been found in institutionalized individuals and studies have suggested a strong correlation between anti-social behavior and the XYY individual. Furthermore, the relationship of genetics and biochemistry to behavior may suggest that the presence of an extra Y chromosome could be a cause of the anti-social behavior observed in XYY males.[45]

Ashley Montague writing in the popular journal, Psychology Today, states:

> It appears probable that the ordinary quantum of aggressiveness of a normal XY male is derived from his Y chromosome, and that the addition of another Y chromosome presents a double dose of these potencies that under certain conditions facilitate the development of aggressive behavior.[46]

Forssman, Tsuboi and Slitt, in separate papers, all assert that the XXY and XYY have innate criminal tendencies and that this determinism is adequately documented.[47]

Concurrent with the findings and conclusions of the studies cited above, a somewhat more critical literature has been developing. These works address the problems of the generalizability of data drawn from highly selected institutional populations, the adequacy of the statistical methods used in assessing the data, and so on.

Roebuck and Atlas, while acknowledging the existence of a growing evidence to support the findings of a relationship between chromosomal abnormality and criminal behavior, also point out that the incidence of these anomalies in the general population is still unknown, as is the relationship between abnormal chromosomal structure and antisocial behavior in the general population.[48] Therefore, findings based on the unique samples of presently available studies are not authoritative.

Oliver Gillie, after looking at estimates of the relative incidence of the XYY karyotype in Great Britain concludes that "there must be about 20,000 adult males in the United Kingdom alone living normally and doing no harm to anyone."[49] In a study of 103 boys committed to an institution in Washington for children with severe emotional disorders and antisocial behavior, P. Ferrier _et al_ found no instances of the XYY abnormality, but they did find _two cases_ of XXY.[50] G. R. Clark, _et al_, in a study of some 2,000 inmates at a correctional institution reported:

> Probably about 200,000 XYY males live in the United States. That this is possible is indicated by the increasing reports of "normal" XYY's . . . .
>
> While a more extensive and thorough study of this new minority group is needed, it now appears that in general the XYY male has been falsely stigmatized. The frequency of his involvement in antisocial behavior and crime may not be appreciably different from that of the average citizen.[51]

The same researchers reported the findings of a study of 876 males in prisons and facilities for the mentally retarded which found nine individuals with the XYY and 13 with the XXY patterns. Although groups exhibited criminal and psychotic behavior, the authors because of the small incidence of this syndrome reported:

> Our overall screening experience so far reveals no statistically significant difference in the incidence of sex chromosome errors (significance level, P = 0.05) between penal and nonpenal populations when subjects of all heights and all chromosomal categories are compared.[52]

Amir and Berman found after a critical study of the literature on chromosomal abnormalities that:

> While some regularities of characteristic emerge from the research on the XYY phenomenon, no generalization can yet be made. This is because of the skewness of the sampled population, and the lack of accepted universal definitions of terms, such as "antisocial," "psychopathy," and "aggressiveness."[53]

Richard Fox, after an extensive review of the evidence, sees the investigation of these chromosomal abnormalities as they relate to criminal behavior to be founded on the supportive of a "modern myth."

> Unhappily, it is obvious that in the five years following the first major research publications a mythology has built up around the XYY male which extends to the definition of the syndrome, the nature of the offenses committed, and the offender's rehabilitative potential. Very little of this is warranted by the information at hand . . . .
>
> In the future the question whether legislative policies are to be formed, and administrative decisions made, in accordance with XYY methology or XYY reality may have to be faced . . . . The reality is that XYY males in an institutional setting are less violent or aggressive when compared to matched chromosomally normal fellow inmates; and their criminal histories involve crimes against property rather than persons.[54]

And, finally, David Baker after reviewing an extensive literature on this topic concludes somewhat wistfully:

> Fifty-six years later, bearing a splendorous accumulation of data, we arrive at William Healy's conclusion. After an analysis of over 800 delinquents, finding no special quality of abnormality or degeneracy, he wrote, "In view of the immense complexity of human nature in relation to complex environmental conditions, it is little to us even if no set theory of crime can ever be successfully maintained."[55]

Thus, we must conclude at this time that the relationship between chromosomal abnormalities and criminal behavior has not been established.

We shall deal with one additional area here only briefly because the work has serious methodological shortcomings, that of the relationship between physique and behavior.[56] Sheldon, the Gluecks, Cortes and Gatti, Epps and Parnell (all cited by Shah, 1972, pp. 141-142) have all taken a neo-Lombrosian approach in their attempts to explain criminal behavior by measuring and typing body dimensions. None of these studies adequately addresses the questions of sampling variability, general population characteristics, measurement accuracy and reliability and social labeling in their assertions that criminal behavior is related to the short, stocky, muscular body type. Indeed, we hypothesize that very little of the variation of the behavior in a population may be explained by body shape.

## Conclusions and Policy Implications for Delinquency Prevention

We have not assessed most of the work cited in this paper in terms of methodological adequacy, except for an occasional allusion to the problem, for two reasons:

A large-scale evaluation of the research and theory in criminology is presently drawing to a close.[57] Out of some 4,000 books and articles evaluated in that project only three percent were judged to be methodologically of high quality. The variables used to perform this assessment included those relating to sampling procedures, statistical testing, concordance of reported findings with the data presented, the development of hypotheses and operational definitions and so on. Most of the biologically-oriented research reviewed in this paper is methodologically poor. Generalizations are made from a handful of cases: typically between two to 20 individuals; no attempt is ever made to develop an adequate sampling plan, let alone carry one out; research designs, where they exist, are inadequate for the kinds of generalizations presented; statistical analyses with hypothesis testing is rarely undertaken; physiological measurements and generalizations are offered without any regard given to the crucially important prerequisites of demonstrated validity and reliability. In sum, a general lack of sensitivity to the whole area of statistical and methodological techniques runs through this literature. Thus, the technical adequacy of the work in biological criminality is probably similar to that found in most criminological research. These shortcomings would become important for our purposes here if, in fact, general agreement or a concordance of findings were found in the various subject areas discussed. However, as we have seen, most of the findings are indeterminate.

Thus, we are not in a position, in any event, to make policy recommendations in topic domains where the evidence, even if it is generated from shaky methodological designs, is inconclusive.

As we stated earlier on in this paper, the requirement for conclusive, well-documented evidence must be met before one can make policy recommendations in areas where the costs of incorrectly acting are great. We would place most of the social policy decisions for which the relationship between biology and crime is relevant into that category. Let us review our findings with regard for the amount of support each offers for the development of policy standards.

1. Brain tumors, particularly those affecting the limbic system, have been shown to cause unprovoked violent behavior in some individuals. Surgical removal of the affected area sometimes eliminates these violent outbursts while,

oftentimes, also causing unpredictable and undesirable behavior changes. Sterotactic destruction of focal areas of the brain, especially the amygdala, have made the behavioral changes somewhat more predictable.

In extreme cases of violent psychosis when medication and psychotherapy have failed this kind of radical treatment may be the only remaining avenue for possible relief from attacks of uncontrollable violence. However, this kind of intervention is fraught with social and political implications because of its lack of repeatability, predictability and reversibility.

2. Although the evidence is mixed, temporal lobe epilepsy seems correlated to violent crime, ictally, interictally or postictally. Delinquency prevention standards, therefore, should not deal with this malady.

3. Electroencephalograms are open to differing interpretations: this is, the reliability is not routinely high. The relationship of "abnormal" EEG's to violent behavior has not been established except in cases where severe limbic disturbances are present. Therefore, we do not advocate EEG screening in a "fishing net" approach to uncover these disturbances in a population.

4. Studies of hormone levels and behavior also exhibit indeterminate findings. The administration of estrogen reduces the libido in male sex offenders, while testosterone has been shown to reduce the symptoms of institutionalized male XXY offenders. However, the findings are inconclusive and do not support any policy decisions in this area.

5. Concerning minimal brain damage as it relates to hyperkinetic behavior, learning disabilities, psychomotor instability and school behavioral problems, we may without reservation, offer some recommendations. Minimal brain damage has been related convincingly to cerebral damage incurred during the prenatal, perinatal and early postnatal formative periods of brain development. These traumas are most probably caused by nutritional and/or oxygen deficiencies _in utero_, or during or shortly after birth, and by protein and sensory insufficiency during the early years of child development. The fact that this disability is strongly associated with lower socioeconomic status further supports the hypothesis that this malformation is related to various kinds of _social deprivation_.

We suggest that policies be considered which will a) provide adequate prenatal medical care and nutrition to ensure that the uterine environment will be supportive to the developing fetus; b) provide adequate medical assistance during birth so that perinatal complications will be minimized; and, c) provide adequate protein diets and social and intellectual stimulation to the developing infant and young child.

6. With regard to heredity and crime, XXY and XYY syndromes and crime, physique and delinquency, we may state that there is insufficient evidence to support any policy decision which would be relevant to these topic areas.

Crime and delinquency are socially defined. The labeling of an individual as a delinquent because he or she has violated some proscription is a social act. The behaviors which we have reviewed are not, in themselves, criminal actions. Aggressive behavior, violent behavior, fits of rage, hyperactivity and impulsiveness are not criminal unless they occur at a certain time and place where such behaviors will be deemed illegal. Thus, it must be remembered that a biological structure, (an individual), develops, exists in (and cointeracts with) its environment, but that environment is of paramount importance in influencing the behavior of its individual members. The persistence, growth and pervasiveness of delinquency in a society is, thus, a *social* phenomenon, not a personal or individual construct. The causes of delinquency are not to be found in individual biologies, but rather in societal interaction.

Footnotes:

---

[1] John Money, "Behavior Genetics: Principles, Methods and Examples from XO, XXY and XYY Syndromes," in *Seminars in Psychiatry*, Vol. 2, No. 1, Feb. 1970, p. 22.

[2] David Baka, "Chromosome Errors and Antisocial Behavior," in *Critical Reviews in Clinical Laboratory Sciences*, Vol. 3, Issue 1, p. 92.

[3] Saleem A. Shah, "Recent Development in Human Genetics and Their Implications to Problems of Social Deviance," in *National Foundation Birth Defects*, Vol. 8, July 1972, pp. 48-49.

[4] Of course, the age structure of a population has a definite bearing on the overall level of violative activity. At this point in time the United States is experiencing an inflation in the delinquency-prone age group, to some extent, than the "crime wave" in the United States is a product of the age-specific crime rates and the population age structure. However, the biological composition we are referring to relates to genetic, physiological and hormonal structure.

[5] We shall not attempt an exhaustive review of the literature at this time. Instead we shall examine the findings of several representative studies and discuss the remainder in general terms. The interested reader is referred to the following papers if a more complete literature review is desired.

David Baka, Ibid., pp. 41-101.

Saleem Shah and Loren H. Roth, "Biological and Psychophysiological Factors in Criminality," in Daniel Glaser, Handbook of Criminology, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1974, pp. 101-173.

[6] Saleem Shah, Ibid., pp. 110-111.

[7] See Vernon H. Mark and Frank R. Ervin, Violence and the Brain, Harper and Row, New York, 1970, pp. 13-24 for a discussion of the anatomy of the brain as it relates to this topic.

[8] Mark and Ervin, Ibid., pp. 31-32.

[9] Mark and Ervin, Ibid., pp. 33.

[10] William H. Sweet, Frank Ervin, and Vernon H. Mark, "The Relationship of Violent Behavior to Focal Cerebral Disease," in Aggressive Behavior, Edited by S. Garattini and E. B. Sigg, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1969, pp. 336.

[11] Source: Paillas, 1958, as reported in Sweet, Ervin and Mark, Ibid., pp. 339.

[12] R. G. Heath and W. A. Mickle, "Evaluation of 7 Years' Experience with Depth Electrode Studies in Human Patients," as reported in Sweet, Ervin and Mark, Ibid., pp. 339.

[13] P. Gloor, 1960, as reported in Sweet, Ervin and Mark, Ibid., pp. 350.

[14] See Mark and Ervin, 1970, op. cit., pp. 69-87 for a description of this technique.

[15] Mark and Ervin, 1970, op. cit., pp. 87.

[16] Ernst A. Rodin, "Psychomotor Epilepsy and Aggressive Behavior," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 28, Feb., 1973, pp. 210.

[17] Christopher Ounsted, "Aggression and Epilepsy Rage in Children with Temporal Lobe Epilepsy," Journal of Psychosomatic Research, Vol. 13, 1969, pp. 237-242.

[18] C. H. Alstrom, Study of Epilepsy and Its Clinical, Social and Genetic Aspects, Copenhagen, Monksgaard, 1950, pp. 102.

[19] Samuel Livingston, "Epilepsy and Murder," Journal of the American Medical Association, April 13, 1964, pp. 164.

[20] D. Stafford-Clark and F. H. Taylor, "Clinical and Electroencephalographic Studies of Prisoners Charged With Murder," Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry, Vol. 12, 1949, pp. 325-330.

D. Hill and D. A. Pond, "Reflections on 100 Capital Cases Admitted to Electroencephalography," Journal of Mental Science, Vol. 98, 1952, pp. 23-43.

A. C. Mundy-Castle, "The EEG in 22 Cases of Murder and Attempted Murder. Appendix on possible significance of alphoid rhythms," Journal of National Institute of Personnel Research, Vol. 6, 1955, pp. 103-120.

G. E. Winkler and S. S. Kove, "The Implications of Electroencephalographic Abnormalities in Homicide Cases," Journal of Neuropsychiatry, Vol. 3, 1962, pp. 322-330.

Z. A. Sayed, S. A. Lewis and R. P. Brittain, "An Electroencephalographic and Psychiatric Study of 32 Insane Murderers," British Journal of Psychology, Vol. 115, 1969, pp. 1115-1124.

[21] Stafford-Clark and Taylor, 1949, Ibid., pp. 330.

[22] Sayed, Lewis and Brittain, 1969, Ibid., pp. 1123.

[23] Joyce G. Small, "The Organic Dimension of Crime," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 15, July, 1966, pp. 82-89, quote on page 88.

[24] R. J. Ellingson, "The Incidence of EEG Abnormality Among Patients With Mental Disorders of Apparently Nonorganic Origin: A Critical Review," American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 111, 1955, pp. 263-275, quote from pp. 270-271.

[25] Dennis Williams, "Neural Factors Related to Habitual Aggression," Brain, Vol. 92, 1969, pp. 513.

[26] R. C. Kolodry, W. H. Masters, J. Hendryx and G. Toro, "Plasma Testosterone and Semen Changes in Male Homosexuals," New England Journal of Medicine, Vol. 285, 1971, 1170-1174.

[27] F. L. Golla and R. S. Hodge, "Hormone Treatment of the Sexual Offender," The Lancet, June 11, 1949, pp. 1006-1007.

[28] Golla and Hodge, Ibid., pp. 1007.

[29] Shah, 1974, op. cit., pp. 124.

[30] Lester Tarnopol, "Delinquency and Minimal Brain Dysfunction," Journal of Learning Disabilities, Vol. 3, March, 1970, pp. 201.

[31] Abraham Towbin, "Organic Causes of Minimal Brain Dysfunction," Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 217, No. 9, Aug. 30, 1971, pp. 1207.

[32] Towbin, 1971, Ibid., pp. 1208.

[33] F. J. Schulte, "Current Concepts in Minimal Brain Dysfunction," Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 217, No. 9, Aug. 30, 1971, pp. 1237-1238.

[34] Schulte, 1971, Ibid., pp. 1237.

[35] Tarnopol, 1970, op. cit., pp. 206.

[36] M. M. Menkes, J. S. Rowe, J. H. Menkes, "A Twenty-Five Year Follow-Up Study on the Hyperkinetic Child With Minimal Brain Dysfunction," Pediatrics, Vol. 39, No. 3, March, 1967, pp. 393-399.

[37] Sheldon M. Litt, "Perinatal Complications and Criminality," Proceedings, 80th Annual Convention, A.P.A., 1972, pp. 239-240.

[38] Litt, 1972, Ibid., pp. 240.

[39] K. O. Christiansen, "Threshold of Tolerance in Various Population Groups Illustrated by Results from the Danish Criminologies Twin Study," in A.V.S. deReuck and R. Porta (eds.), The Mentally Abnormal Offender.

[40] Shah, 1974, op. cit., pp. 131-134 and Shal, 1972, op. cit., pp. 42-82.

[41] W. H. Price, P. B. Whatmore and W. F. McClemont, "Criminal Patients with XYY Sex-Chromosome Complement," The Lancet, March 12, 1966, pp. 565-566.

[42] J. Nielsen, T. Tsuboi, G. Sturup and D. Romano, "XYY Chromosomal Constitution in Criminal Psychopaths," The Lancet, Sept. 7, 1968, pp. 576.

[43] M. A. Telfer, D. Baker, G. R. Clark and C. E. Richardson, "Incidence of Gross Chromosomal Errors Among Tall Criminal American Males," Science, March, 1968, pp. 1249-1250.

[44] R. Housley, "Criminal Law: The XYY Chromosome Complement and Criminal Conduct," Oklahoma Law Review, Vol. 22, No. 3, 1969, pp. 287-301.

[45] K. J. Burke, "The XYY Syndrome: Genetics, Behavior, and the Law," Denver Law Journal, Vol. 46, Spring, 1969, pp. 261-285.

[46] A. Montague, "Chromosomes and Crime," Psychology Today, Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 43-49.

[47] H. Forssman, "The Mental Implications of Sex Chromosome Aberrations," British Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 117, 1970, pp. 353-363.

T. Tsuboi, "Crimino-Biologic Study of Patients With the XYY Syndrome and Klinefelter's Syndrome," Humangenetic, Vol. 10, 1974, pp. 68-84.

W. Slitt, "The XYY Chromosome Abnormality and Criminal Behavior," Connecticut Law Review, Vol. 3, 1971, pp. 484-510.

[48] J. Roebuck and R. H. Atlas, "Chromosomes and the Criminal," Journal of Social Therapy, Vol. 15, 1969, pp. 103-117.

[49] O. Gillie, "Criminals Are Made, Not Born - XYY Chromosome Theory Exploded," Science Journal, Vol. 6, No. 12, Dec., 1970, pp. 8.

[50] P. E. Ferrier, S. A. Ferrier and J. Nielson, "Chromosome Study of a Group of Male Juvenile Delinquents," Pediatric Research, Vol. 4, 1970, pp. 205.

[51] G. R. Clark, M. A. Telfer, D. Baker, M. Rosen, "Sex Chromosomes, Crime and Psychosis," American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 126, No. 11, Aug., 1970, pp. 1659-1663.

[52] D. Baker, M. A. Telfer, C. E. Richardson, G. R. Clark, "Chromosome Error in Men With Antisocial Behavior," Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol 214, No. 5, Nov., 1970, pp. 869-878.

[53] M. Amir and Y. Berman, "Chromosomal Deviation and Crime," Federal Probation, Vol. XXXIV, June, 1970, pp. 55-62.

[54] R. G. Fox, "The XYY Offender: A Modern Myth?" Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Public Sciences, Vol. 62, No. 1, 1971, pp. 59-73, quote from pp. 72.

[55] D. Baker, "Chromosome Errors and Antisocial Behavior," CRC Critical Reviews in Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Vol. 3, No. 1, Jan., 1972, pp. 41-101, quote from pp. 94.

[56] See Shah, 1972, op. cit., for a full description of this area.

[57] M. Wolfgang, R. Figlio. T. Thornberry. An Evaluation of Theory and Research in Criminology, 1945-1972, forthcoming, 1976.

# V - LABELING THEORY

Labeling analysis became prominent among sociologists during the 1960's as a move away from earlier explanations of crime, deviance, and social problems which focused attention upon the personal characteristics of offenders. Most attempts until this point to prevent delinquency were based on the thesis that delinquency is derived from characteristics (psychological, socioeconomic, or biological) which need correction in order to halt further delinquency by that individual. In contrast, labeling analysis focuses attention upon the process by which individuals are defined as delinquents, and upon such factors as the selective perception of youth by social control agents, youthful self-conceptions and the alleged harmful impact of the existing juvenile justice system on many juveniles.

Labeling theory has its roots in the social psychology or "symbolic interactionism" of George Herbert Mead.[1] The interactionist perspective focuses on how social reaction creates one's self-image and thus regulates future behavior. Mead argued that the complex interaction between the actor and societal reaction taught the actor the norms of behavior of the society. This approach presumes that everyone's personality starts out essentially as neutral, that they are reacted to either positively or negatively, and from this reaction, their personal identity is learned. Identity is believed to strongly influence human behavior. Some labeling analysts have taken Mead's social psychology and adapted it to deviant behavior; other labeling theorists have focused only on the external aspects of labeling--i.e., how initial stigmatization creates further negative social reactions for the deviant. While it is admitted that a number of factors may produce delinquent behavior, the critical element in labeling theory is societal reaction, or the labeling process. For example, socioeconomic factors may have great influence on who is defined as delinquent, but for most labeling theorists, it is the labeling process itself which is most influential in developing delinquent and criminal careers.

Labeling theorists conceive of delinquency as those behaviors or those statuses which are defined as delinquent by those with the power to enforce those definitions. Howard Becker has stated, "the deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied, deviant behavior is behavior that people so label."[2] Becker argues that deviance is not a result of the individual act, but a result of the interaction between the act and societal reaction to the act:

"Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders."[3] For example, some children may be labeled as delinquent, who in fact have not broken any rule while some others who have violated rules will not be labeled violators. In other instances, the label will be applied for reasons other than "simple behavior;" for example, the process of deciding on a legal charge. The critical factor to consider is the process of social definition of delinquent behavior, and this depends not entirely on the act, but also on the reaction of others.

## Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Some labeling theorists use the common sense idea of the self-fulfilling prophecy. They assert that if an individual is continually told that he or she is delinquent and differentially treated because of this label, eventually that person comes to believe that the label is true and begins acting according to the expectations of others. The important insight of the labeling perspectives is that, unintentionally, social agencies, persons and programs that are trying to help children may be the same sources which convince them that they are in fact "delinquents." For instance, labeling theorists say that processing by the juvenile court sets the child apart from other youth who do not go to court and this formal legal processing changes the self-image of the child in harmful ways. A possible sequence of events in this transformation is as follows: behaviors which a youth considers to be fun and part of play may be considered undesirable and bad by parents, police officers and others, who attempt to suppress them. If the behavior and its negative social reaction continues, the youth may begin to view himself as a bad person rather than that the problem is just his immediate behavior. Such children may feel set apart from (or different from) "good children" and seek companions who seem to enjoy the same sort of behavior, and who do not act disapprovingly. Affiliations with "deviant" groups may cause further negative labeling of the child resulting in treatment consistent with the label, such as avoidance, surveillance, punishment, arrest or incarceration. Eventually the child identifies itself as a delinquent and begins to employ delinquency "as a means of defense, attack or adjustment to the overt and covert problems created by the consequent social reaction to him,"[4] to use Lemert's words. The child has made the transformation from an individual who engaged in socially unacceptable behaviors to one who now defines himself as a delinquent, with resulting delinquent behavior that is an adaptation to this new status and the reactions of others. The important point in this sequence is that labeling of a person as delinquent began the process in which the potentially false prophecy of delinquency was fulfilled.

## Primary and Secondary Deviation

Edwin Lemert's development of the ideas of primary and secondary deviation is an advanced statement of the labeling position.[5] Primary deviation is behavior caused by a complex of social, cultural, psychological, and physiological factors and this behavior is assumed to have no lasting impact on the actor's view of himself. Secondary deviance refers to the process by which the initial response of society may confirm a deviant into continued deviant behavior. For example, an offender placed on parole is subject to additional behavioral restrictions and more surveillance which increase the possibility that this person will receive further negative social actions. Moreover, the parolee may internalize this special surveillance as evidence of "not being capable of trust." Primary deviance may or may not change the status of the person in the eyes of those around them and there may be no special treatment because of this behavior. Labeling theory posits that the impulse to engage in primary deviant behavior is widespread, and not limited to those who actually commit delinquent acts. Many persons do deviate, and societal reaction, in general, is not sufficient to cause the individual to view himself as delinquent.

Lemert suggests that secondary deviation is different from primary deviation in its origins and impact upon individuals because of the stigmatizing process during which the individual accepts the view of himself as a delinquent. Further delinquent acts become a means of dealing with the problems created by this stigmatization. These additional acts are necessary for the progressive commitment to delinquent behavior, and is essentially a defense reaction to stigmatization and exclusion. The previously-mentioned complex of social, cultural, psychological and physiological factors which give rise to the primary deviation are no longer at work in secondary deviation. Lemert gives the example of women labeled as prostitutes working out their role and identity conflicts through establishing closer relationships with pimps, or in lesbian relationships. These actions sustain the deviant identity of the prostitute, but also provide a cushion from the societal reaction. Social reaction theorists assert the greater impact of secondary deviation in the permanent commitment to delinquency, but this assertion has not been convincingly demonstrated by empirical research.

## Selective Perception of Youth by Social Control Agents

One issue which is important to labeling theory is the explanation of differential rates of delinquency among various racial or socioeconomic groups. It is generally assumed by labeling theorists that delinquency is widespread in all classes but that those in the lower socioeconomic classes are more likely to be officially labeled delinquent because of inequities in the privilege structure of the society. And it is the institutions which participate in the labeling process--police, courts, correctional facilities and schools--which have been criticized by some labeling theorists as unfairly enforcing white, middle-class values in defining delinquency and processing delinquents. Labeling theorists argue that those youth who exhibit socially approved personal characteristics are protected by social control agencies from the label "delinquent" or "predelinquent." For example, Chambliss gives an account of two adolescent groups referred to as the Saints and the Roughnecks.[6] The Saints, from middle-class families, acted sufficiently submissive and repentent when apprehended to be released, and the Roughnecks, from lower socioeconomic families, appeared belligerent and hostile to law enforcement authorities. The Saints were never characterized as being delinquents though they did indeed engage in such behavior (drunkenness, truancy, vandalism) whereas the Roughnecks were so labeled even though their activities were quite similar to that of the Saints. Chambliss indicates that it is not simply the demeanor, attitudes, and expectations of middle-class youths that predispose them not to be stigmatized as delinquent, but also the economic freedom which allows them to indulge in their activities out of sight of people who know them. Having access to cars enables them to go to a neighboring city to drink, or having money allows them to "horse around" in a restaurant rather than on the streets. A class differential in terms of image, economic freedom, and behavior expectations exists, but not in terms of the actual behavior engaged in. Selective perception of youth, based upon the middle-class values of law enforcement officials and others can play a major role in determining the population labeled as delinquent.

Labeling theories argue that other delinquency theorists have assumed that delinquency is characteristic of lower-class youths (rather than being equally distributed throughout the classes) and therefore there has been too much concern with the special biological and psychological characteristics of delinquents or their values, attitudes and interpersonal relationships with family and peers. The position of labeling theory is that there is nothing inherently differentiating nondelinquents from delinquents; if there are peculiar traits which characterize these populations, these differences are a function of the interaction between the agents of control and the characteristics of individuals. One is more likely to be labeled a delinquent if one is from the lower classes, male and not white, but these correlations do not stem from pathological anomalies; they stem from the narrow institutionalized middle-class expectations of proper behavior which are applied to all youth by agents of social control.

## Discriminatory Practices

The focus of study for labeling theory has been on rule-making and social reaction to the breaking of rules. This approach suggests, ironically, that the attempt to impose rules to prevent delinquency may, in fact, actually create youthful delinquency. Labeling theorists argue that social control leads to deviance or that social control creates deviance. Because of this emphasis on the social control process, labeling theorists have paid close attention to those social institutions and agencies which control crime and delinquency.

One labeling theorist, Carl Werthman, has studied how expectations regarding authority relationships between participants in a number of social situations (e.g., parents and children, teachers and students, police and juveniles) affect the labeling process. Werthman[6] refers to ways in which some police departments seem predisposed to label certain groups as deviant solely on the basis of appearance. Black juveniles, in particular, are susceptible to the suspicion of police. Often entire neighborhoods, particular styles of dress or hair and walking manners are objects of suspicion by police. Juveniles insult the authority of the police officers by refusing to offer the expected signs of respect through their nonchalance and indifference. The officer may feel compelled to arrest, use force, or retire from such a potential conflict situation as gracefully as possible. The ways in which the child is able to maintain its own "moral character" are the very characteristics which cause successful labeling to take place. Once a child is labeled and under the control of the juvenile justice system, this same system may set the conditions which provoke the juvenile to commit another offense. Werthman gives the example of a young boy sent to a foster home because he came from a broken home and his mother (primary deviation) was declared an unfit mother. The boy missed school (truancy) to see his mother and broke the terms of his probation (secondary deviation) by seeing his mother without official approval. Thus, the label "delinquent" substantially increased the probability of future norm-violating behavior.

## Juvenile Status Offenses

The sort of analysis applied by labeling theorists assumes that there are large inequities in socioeconomic status, differences in power, and a diversity of values which exist in the society. It is further assumed that major changes in the structure and values of the society could do much to reduce delinquency rates. For instance, labeling theorists are critical of the values which govern much of the juvenile justice system, not only in terms of discriminatory enforcement patterns, but they also criticize the broad and often vague categories of offenses which apply only to young people.

The special legal burdens of the young are referred to as juvenile status offenses. Juveniles are subject to arrest and incarceration for a wide variety of behaviors which would not be criminal if committed by adults. These offenses include truancy, running away, consensual sexual behavior, smoking, drinking, curfew violation, incorrigibility, and disobeying parental authority, in addition to many others. Rather than being criminal offenses in which there is injury to property or persons, status offenses are prohibitions on behavior deemed inappropriate for juveniles. Placing status offenders through juvenile court processes, say the labeling theorists, has created another group of youths who become victims of the labeling process.

The anomaly of status offenses leads sociologists like Edwin Schur to conclude that if given the choice between changing youth or changing society's toleration of youthful behavior, he would choose to change the society.[8] Schur advocates changes in social structure and values which would allow the widest possible diversity of youthful behavior and attitudes, rather than forcing children to rigidly conform to a limited set of expectations. Schur is quick to indicate that he does not mean allowing any and all behaviors, but he believes that in the past, limitations of behavior have surpassed necessary constraints for a smooth-functioning, peaceful society.

## Attachments and Commitments

Rather than discussing the causes of delinquency, some authors of the labeling school have studied the opposite question--what makes people conform to norms?[9] This school of thought is complementary to the more external analysis of negative labeling. These researchers suggest that attachment to conventional institutions such as the family, schools, and religion decreases the likelihood of engaging in delinquency. The quality of relationships with parents or teachers influences whether an individual will commit delinquent acts. Positive relationships will reinforce the values of institutions and persons in authority, whereas negative experiences will weaken and neutralize ties to authority. When the child feels aliented from symbols of authority, such as parents or teachers, this increases the likelihood of delinquent acts. This position is consistent with labeling theory for if relationships are to be positive, individuals must be getting some favorable social reactions about themselves. Positive feedback from "significant others" results in a self-image which encourages actions which conform to expectations of social institutions such as the schools or the family.

## Comments on the Status of Labeling Theory

Because labeling theorists assume that behavior falling within the definitional boundaries of delinquency is a normal part of growing up, they have downplayed questions of etiology. They claim to reject the notion that mechanistic forces beyond the control of the individual compel him/her to commit delinquent acts; they reject deterministic notions of delinquency, and instead posit that youths have choices as to whether they will, in fact, commit acts of delinquency. In support of the idea that youth are not "propelled" into delinquency, they cite the fact that a vast majority of activities of even those youths labeled "hardcore" delinquents consists of nondelinquent acts. Delinquency arises out of the interaction of social, psychological, economic and cultural contexts and cannot be understood as "simple" behavior.

Some have criticized the explanation of primary deviation as a "result of random impulses" which have no meaning for the individual.[10] In the case of secondary deviation, the delinquent chooses to continue in delinquent activities because this adaptation seems a solution to personal problems. The stigmatization process has changed the delinquent's options and expectations so that satisfaction may come from engaging in further delinquency. This makes it appear that choice is not available to nondelinquents as it is the process of degradation or stigmatization which produces changes in the delinquent's values which then open up greater options than are available for nondelinquents.

There has been criticism of the distinction made by Lemert of the two kinds of deviation. Taylor, Walton and Young indicate that it has not been proven in practice that these two types of deviation are conceptually or actually distinguishable. Moreover, with the exception of political criminals or participants in professional crime, it is not clear that there are deviants whose whole lives and identities revolve around deviance--calling into question the idea of "community to a deviant career."[11] In addition, many people who are involved in delinquent acts are never officially labeled as such, and labeling theory offers few clues to understanding the dynamics of hidden deviance (e.g., The Saints described by Chambliss mentioned earlier in the paper). Labeling analysis also has not conclusively shown that the factors which cause initial deviation are no longer at work in the continuing commitment to delinquency.

Labeling theorists have not specified the conditions under which social reaction will, in fact, influence an individual's continued involvement in delinquency. We know that there is differential acceptance of police, teachers, or criminal justice personnel labeling among young people that is probably related to their reference groups. For example, a police arrest may not have the same meaning for a middle-class white youth as it does for an economically poor black youth. Moreover, the extent to which social reaction influences a deviant may in part depend on whether the deviant sees social reaction as "legitimate." Having a prison or arrest record will mean different things in terms of employment, stigmatization and reputation to youth depending upon their reference groups and position in the social structre. The fear of having an arrest record, or being labeled delinquent in minority communities (where many members of the community are so labeled) may be different than in communites in which delinquency is believed to be rare. Local definitions of success may oppose conventional society's notions of criminality, e.g., the apparent sucess of "players" or "hustlers," and thus neutralize the psychic import of labeling.

Another problem with labeling theory is the assumption that stigmatization always produces negative results. In some well known examples, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, Synanon or "consciousness-raising groups," the acceptable of the deviant label is considered a crucial step in personal and group reformation. Often the label is accepted by its mean and is transformed in efforts to "politicize the labeling process (e.g., "coming out of the closet" of the gay movement and other deviant groups).

The labeling view has been criticized for lack of precision within its theories and there does not exist a strong empirical literature which has tested the major assertions of this school. Much of the research in support for the labeling views needs to be conducted before a final judgment can be made about the utility of the theory. Moreover, many believe that the labeling perspective should be integrated with other theories of juvenile delinquency--particularly the psychodynamic theories on delinquency--to improve the explanatory power of labeling theory.

Despite these criticisms, the social reaction perspective on delinquency forces us to focus upon interest groups and individuals which form and enforce criminal law, and thus gives a more fully social analysis of delinquent behavior. From this perspective it follows that delinquency research should investigate power relationships and determine how societal reactions work to maintain dominance over persons most likely to be labeled as deviants and delinquents. Most labeling theorists have not gone this far and they sometimes make it appear as though social control agents (such as the police or court officials) are the only "villains." This is a limited view and serves to distrct attention from some of the more serious issues such as poverty, racism or sex discrimination which influence the labeling process.[12]

The importance of the labeling perspective in delinquency theory stems from its emphasis upon the factors which go into creating delinquency, many of which are external to the individual. Many other theories consider delinquency to be an individual pathology, whereas labeling theory brings attention to the role of the social structure and the social reaction to behavior. Labeling theorists have shown how differential treatment of some groups of individuals (poor, nonwhite) results in their being delinquent.

But, the labeling school has stopped short of providing a fully satisfying explanation of delinquent behavior.

Some of the policy recommendations listed below reflect the explicit portions of the labeling theory; others flow from the implicit assumptions of the analysis.

## Police Implications for Preventing Delinquency

1. The labeling process is a social reaction which creates deviance; it results in stigmatization and exclusion, and can produce a commitment to delinquency.

   Implication--Divert potential delinquents out of the juvenile justice system before the labeling and stigma are attached to these youths. This would include diversion programs. Youth Service Bureaus, and other community-based programs which would keep juveniles out of the traditional system. This is advocated by many different groups such as the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice,[13] and the California Department of the Youth Authority.[14]

2. Juveniles are subject to a special group of status offenses which make them subject to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

   Implication--Narrow the jurisdiction of the juvenile court; it should deal only with criminal conduct and juvenile status offenses should be referred to social service agencies. This is supported by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.[15]

3. There exists selective perception and discriminatory treatment of youth by criminal justice agencies.

   Implication--Police officers, probation officers, teachers, and other criminal justice personnel should be more representative of the populations which they serve, be responsive to them, and where possible be from that community; this might substantially reduce the unjust aspects of the labeling process.

4. Positive attachments to school and, especially, teachers help in the creation of a self-image which may work to prevent delinquency.

   Implication--Make school curriculum relevant and interesting to students; hire teachers and other personnel in the schools who can relate and respond to students and help them create positive self-images.

5. Positive attachments to family members may also counteract delinquency-producing influences.

   Implication--Support family stability through educational, counseling and other service programs designed to hold families together and make them important and rewarding units of personal development.

6. A critical factor in a commitment to delinquency is a poor self-image.

   Implication--Increase recreational, musical, arts and crafts facilities for juveniles to develop talents and identities which create a broad and positive self-image.

7. Middle-class communities are able to protect their children from arrest and contact with the juvenile justice system, and play a role in the sort of law enforcement they desire in their communities, whereas, poor and minority communities are not so organized.

   Implication--Support and fund community efforts, in those areas where youth are most likely to be labeled delinquents, to organize local limits for tolerating youthful behavior and to provide services closely tied to the needs of community youngsters.

## Diversion

In order to curtail the labeling process, diversion programs are suggested to keep juveniles out of the traditional juvenile justice system. Diversion can take several forms, one of which is the Youth Service Bureaus (YSB).

## Juvenile Status Offenses

Status offenses include truancy, smoking, drinking, disobeying authority, consensual sexual behavior, incorrigibility, among others. There are many arguments presented for removing juvenile status offenses from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Rather than subjecting the juvenile to court proceedings and institutionalization, some feel that the individual would receive greater benefit from noncoercive social services such as family counseling, youth service bureaus, health agencies, educational and employment opportunities and other community-based treatment.

In California, of 400,000 juveniles arrested on 1971, two-thirds were status offenders.[16] Nationally, more than one-third of juveniles held in detention for a court hearing are there for juvenile status offenses. Twenty-three percent of males and 70 percent of females in the juvenile correctional institutions are status offenders.[17] The volume of cases in juvenile court and detention facilities would obviously be substantially decreased if the status offenses were removed from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. The elimination of this category would save money not only in court costs, but in the correctional facilities.

A Justice Department study of 1971 states that it cost an average of $6,775 to keep a young person in a correctional facility; in Connecticut the cost was $15,511 and in New York, $11,014.[18] Advocates of abolishing status offenses argue that the labeling as delinquent and stigmatization of juveniles which follows offsets any good that processing through the courts might do. Incarceration of status offenders is difficult to justify under either a treatment or punishment rationale. Status offenders receive no special treatment or counseling while institutionalized and come in contact with juveniles detained for criminal offenses. If status offenders are incarcerated for punishment purposes, institutionalization punishes the less serious offender more than the criminal; the Ohio Youth Commission found that status offenders were incarcerated either as long or longer than juveniles adjudicated for rape, aggravated assault and other felonies.[19]

There is no evidence that spending time in a correctional institution makes an improvement in status offenders' behavior. Detained status offenders don't necessarily have fewer illegitimate children than those not detained, institutionalized truants don't necessarily become better educated than those who are not, incarcerated disobedient youths don't end up in prison less than those not incarcerated. In fact, it may be the case that incarceration makes these children more deviant--an hypothesis which would naturally flow from the labeling perspective.

There are some arguments which can be made opposing the removal of status offenses from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. If the juvenile court does not act in these cases, it is possible that no one else will. Facilities for providing services to juveniles are not generally available in many communities, and there is some question as to their ability to prevent delinquent tendencies in status offenders. Even the highly recommended youth service bureaus instituted in a few hundred cities throughout the country have found it difficult to muster the resources to provide necessary services to youth. In the absence of clearly-defined programs to help juveniles, status offenders should remain within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court which can order the necessary services for these youth who often have grave emotional and family problems.

Adult victimless crimes such as drunkenness, drug addiction, homosexuality, gambling and prostitution still fall within the criminal law; if the analogy is made that status offenses are the equivalent of the adult victimless crimes, particularly in the case of children, it can be argued that it is necessary to protect children from themselves. Protection of children is the prime mandate of most juvenile courts.

If the status offenses are removed from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, this could have unexpected consequences for some communities. For example, the rate of truancy may rise, and the average daily attendance in the public schools decrease; since school funding from state sources is based upon pupil attendance, heightened rates of truancy might decrease state monies which may force cuts in programs and result in even greater rates of truancy.

## Responsive and Representative Community People in Law Enforcement

The police as a social control agency represent a critical point of prevention given the logic of the labeling approach. The antagonism between law enforcement personnel, particularly the police, and those persons most likely to be labeled delinquent has been repeatedly documented.[20] Whole communities are sometimes labeled as criminal by police. Previous hostile encounters with law enforcement officials predispose the community to react suspiciously.

Criminal justice personnel who show respect for the juveniles that come in contact with them will have a greater chance of being respected.

Police departments and other juvenile justice agencies are notorious in their lack of representatives of the community they patrol. And in addition, many policemen live outside of the community in which they work. Approaches to recruiting which attempt to hire and keep personnel who are responsive and representative of the community they serve would go far towards attenuating the negative aspects of the labeling process. Sensitivity training and race relations classes have been offered in police departments, but the results have been less than ideal, e.g., the community relations sections of police departments are generally not desired assignments for police officers.

Persons hired and assigned, who come from that community to be patroled, will have greater sensitivity to the life styles, speech patterns, interaction modes, and dress styles. Presumably, those officers will see as less of a threat than will police officers imported to communities other than their own. The net result would be both more effective law enforcement and less stigmatizing treatment of community youth.

## Personnel and Curriculum in Schools

If positive commitment or attachment to education is critical in preventing delinquency, then it becomes imperative that the curriculum and personnel in schools are relevant and responsive to the needs of students. Schools are one of the major institutions which label and stigmatize youth with such terminology as "educationally handicapped" or "trouble maker." The self-fulfilling prophecy of labeling analysis is confirmed by research which showed that teachers seem to alter their perceptions of student academic performance to correspond with information which they are given about the I.Q. scores of their pupils. For example, teachers who are told that they are teaching "very bright" students will give out higher grades than those told that their pupils have average I.Q. scores. The labeling process progressively cuts off options from juveniles as it continues to occur. In the schools, the stigmatization process can occur quite early; in some cases children will receive negative labels as early as five years old.

Funds should be provided for research to determine what kinds of teaching styles and methods work best in specific situations and how best to prepare and present curriculum. Unfortunately, the results of that sort of research would probably show what is a commonly accepted idea--that teaching methods and differences in presentation of curriculum are not nearly as important as the teachers in fostering learning. Although the teacher needs something to work with (i.e., relevant curriculum), it is the relationship between the teacher and student which is one of the critical factors in how children learn. For this reason it is important to have teachers who relate well and who are respected by those children most likely to be labeled as delinquent or as troublemaker. Cessation of the stigmatizing process of young children coupled with a strong commitment to learn at an early age could be a critical factor in the reduction of delinquency.

## Importance of the Family

Commitment to community institutions, such as the family, can aid in delinquency prevention and it is necessary that we make the family important for all its members. For example, family life could be strengthened by providing ways to more easily achieve the basic needs of economic survival.

The existing social and economic structure of many communities contributes greatly to the difficulty of sustaining a comfortable, loving and meaningful family life, particularly for minority and lower socioeconomic families. The struggle for survival detracts from attempts to foster meaningful interaction; the pressures and frustrations for economic survival can be vented at family members which harms the relationship. Family counseling services, health services and employment and educational counseling should be available for families.

It is difficult to imagine arguments against strengthening the family, but there are objections to the guaranteed jobs and incomes or restructuring of the welfare laws. However, it has been the view of most theorists of delinquency that unless there are major changes which redress socioeconomic inequities there is little hope of significant reductions in rates of delinquency.

## Self-Image

If the self-image is a critical variable in labeling theory, then it is important to develop programs which foster broad and multi-faceted self-images among the young. It is therefore recommended that facilities and programs for juveniles be designed to develop athletic, musical, artistic and crafts abilities. The more a child identifies with positive rather than delinquent images, the greater the likelihood of preventing delinquency. According to labeling theory, if the juvenile should commit certain acts and is labeled a delinquent, there will be other identities to compete with the delinquent identity and perhaps retard the process of secondary deviation. Middle- and upper-class children have these opportunities and identities already open to them and rates of delinquency appear to be relatively lower than in less affluent areas. In terms of opening up ever-decreasing positive role options for persons labeled as delinquents, these sorts of programs appear worthy of experimentation and implementation.

## Community Definition and Prevention

Community efforts to organize themselves to define and prevent delinquency is implicit in the labeling theory, particularly when the successful efforts of middle-class communities to define and protect their interests are considered. An organized community can be important in a number of respects in delinquency prevention efforts. An organization can let its constituents know what will or will not be tolerated and provide sanctions which are relevant. It can let its constituents know that it disapproves of delinquent acts, as does the larger society. It can educate its constituents politically so that delinquents become aware of what harm they are doing to the community and themselves. Organized communities can direct efforts and energies into social action which can benefit both the individual and community.

Footnotes:

[1] See Anselm Strauss, The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

[2] Becker, Howard, "Deviance and the Response of Others" in Cressey and Ward, Delinquency, Crime and Social Process, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 1969, pp. 585.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Lemert, Edwin, "Primary and Secondary Deviation" in Cressey and Ward, Delinquency, Crime and Social Process, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 1969, pp. 604.

[5] Lemert, Edwin, "Primary and Secondary Deviation" in Cressey and Ward, Delinquency, Crime and Social Process, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 1969, 603-607; Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

[6] William Chambliss, "The Saints and the Roughnecks," Society, November-December, 19__, pp. 24-31.

[7] Werthman, Carl, "Delinquency and Moral Character" in Cressey and Ward, Delinquency, Crime and Social Process, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 1969, pp. 613-634.

[8] Schur, Edwin M., Radical Nonintervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973, p. 155.

[9] See Schur's discussion on this research, op. cit., 158.

[10] See for example, Taylor, Walton and Young, The New Criminology, New York, Evanston, San Francisco and London: Harper & Row, 1973, p. 154.

[11] Taylor, Walton and Young, op. cit., p. 153.

[12] See also, Liazos, Alexander, "The Poverty of the Sociology of Deviance: Nuts, Sluts and Perverts," Social Problems, 20: 103-20 (Summer), 1972.

[13] President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crimes, Washington, D.C., 1967.

[14] See Knight, Doug, "A California Strategy for Preventing Crime and Delinquency," a publication of the California Youth Authority, Sacramento, California, 1975.

[15] National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Jurisdiction Over Status Offenses Should be Removed From the Juvenile Courts," NCCD Policy Pamphlet, 1975.

[16] National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "The Status Offender," Fact Sheet #8, 1975.

[17] National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Justice for Juveniles," Fact Sheet #2, 1975.

[18] Rector, Milton G., "PINS Cases: An American Scandal," National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1974.

[19] National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Jurisdiction Over Status Offenses Should be Removed From the Juvenile Court," NCCD Policy Pamphlet, 1974, p. 3.

[20] See for example, Skolnick, Jerome H., The Politics of Protest, Ch. VII, "The Police in Protect," New York; Ballantine Books, 1969; Jerome Skolnick, Justice Without Trial, New York: Wiley, 1966.

Bibliography:

1. Becker, Howard, "Deviance and the Response of Others" in Cressey and Ward, Delinquency, Crime and Social Process, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 585-589, 1969.
2. Chambliss, William J., "The Saints and the Roughnecks," Society, November-December, 24-31.
3. Duxbury, Elaine, "Evaluation of Youth Service Bureaus," State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, 1973.
4. Goffman, Erving, Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
5. Kitsuse, John I., "Societal Reactions to Deviant Behavior: Problems of Theory and Method," Social Problems, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Winter 1963), 247-256, 1963.
6. Knight, Doug, "A California Strategy for Preventing Crime and Delinquency," a publication of the California Youth Authority, Sacramento, California, 1975.
7. Lemert, Edwin, Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

"Primary and Secondary Deviation," in Cressey and Ward, *Delinquency, Crime and Social Process*, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 603-607, 1969.

8. Martin, John M. "Toward a Political Definition of Juvenile Delinquency," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, 1970.

9. Matza, David, *Delinquency and Drift*, New York, London and Sidney: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

10. Mintz, Robert, "The Feasibility of Pretrial Diversion for Misdemeanant Defendants in San Francisco," a study prepared for the Mayor's Criminal Justice Council.

11. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "Jurisdiction Over Status Offenses Should be Removed from the Juvenile Court," NCCD Policy Pamphlet, 1974.

    "Justice for Juveniles," Fact Sheet #2, 1975a.

    "The Status Offender," Fact Sheet #8, 1975b.

12. Office of the Chief of Police, "General Order No. 7, Positive Direction Program for Juveniles," San Francisco (Police Department), Calif., 1975.

13. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crimes, Washington, D.C. 1967.

14. Queen, Jim, "A Proposal for an Alternative Community-Based System to the Present Juvenile Correctional System: A Black Perspective," San Francisco, California, n.d.

15. Rector, Milton G., "PINS Cases: An American Scandal," National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1974.

16. Schur, Edwin M., *Radical Nonintervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

17. Strauss, Anselm (ed.), *The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

18. Sutter, Alan, "Playing a Cold Game," *Urban Life and Culture*, 77-91, 1972.

19. Taylor, Ian; Walton, Paul and Young, Jack, *The New Criminology*, New York, Evanston, San Francisco and London: Harper & Row, 1973.

20. Werthman, Carl, "Delinquency and Moral Character," in Cressey and Ward, *Delinquency, Crime and Social Process*, New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, 613-634, 1969.

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME I: PREVENTING DELINQUENCY

Page

Preface. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

I. Comparative Analysis of Social Control Theories of Delinquency--The Breakdown of Adequate Social Controls. . . . . . . . . . . . 13

II. Comparative Analysis of Subcultural Theories of Delinquency--Delinquency as a Subculture. . . . 56

III. Comparative Analysis of Psychological Theories of Delinquency . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 84

IV. The Biological Bases of Delinquent Behavior. . . . 108

V. Labeling Theory. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 135

Appendix

Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses Prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 154

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME II: POLICE-JUVENILE OPERATIONS

Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Issues

1. Police Roles and Responsibilities. . . . . . . . . . . 3

What are the proper roles and responsibilities of the police in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention?

2. Developing Delinquency Prevention Policy . . . . . . 11

What is the proper role of the police in the development of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention policy?

3. Police Cooperation with Other Agencies . . . . . . . 19

What arrangements should be developed to facilitate cooperation between the police and public and private youth-serving agencies?

4. Police Arrest Authority. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

What is the scope of the police authority to detain and arrest juveniles?

5. Police Authority to Protect Juveniles . . . . . . . 34

What is the scope of police authority in the protection of juveniles?

6. Applicability of the Laws of Arrest. . . . . . . . . 41

Is the law of arrest equally applicable to juveniles who commit criminal acts?

7. Police Discretion. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 47

Should police discretionary decision-making concerning dispositions of juvenile cases be recognized?

Page

8. Guidelines for Police Intercession. . . . . . . . . . 56

What guidelines for police intercession are necessary to provide police services to juveniles?

9. Legal and Procedural Guidelines for Intercession. . . 66

What legal and procedural requirements are necessary to insure that the police intercede properly in providing police services to juveniles?

10. Court Review of Police Guidelines . . . . . . . . . . 72

Should the guidelines used by law enforcement in making decisions regarding juvenile processing be reviewed by court and juvenile intake officials? Should juvenile intake guidelines be reviewed with law enforcement officials?

11. The Organization of Police-Juvenile Operations. . . . 74

How should the police plan the administration and management of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention services?

Appendices

A. Notes Re Arrest Warrants

1. Arrest Warrants . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 86

Should state juvenile codes authorize the court to issue a warrant of arrest (taking into custody) under specified conditions?

2. Arrest Warrants . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 88

Should standards urge that law enforcement officials petition the court for an arrest warrant except where law enforcement officials witness an offense occurring or are able to arrest a juvenile law violator within a very short time following the comission of an offense?

Page

B. Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 89

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME III: COURT STRUCTURE, JUDICIAL AND NON-JUDICIAL PERSONNEL, AND JUVENILE RECORDS

Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Issues

1. Level. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

At what jurisdictional level should the court handling juvenile matters be located?

2. Positioning. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7

Should the court handling juvenile matters be a separate court or should it be a division of a general trial court?

3. Juvenile or Family Court . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

Should the court for handling juvenile matters be a juvenile court or a family court?

4. Scope. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15

What should be the scope of the court's jurisdiction?

5. Qualifications of Judges . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 21

Should Family Court Judges possess special qualifications in addition to those required for general trial court judges?

6. Assignment of Judges . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

Should the assignment of judges to serve on the Family Court be permanent?

7. Other Judicial Officers. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 33

Should judicial officers other than judges be authorized to hear Family Court cases?

Page

8. Support Staff. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 39

Should the Family Court have its own separate Administrative and Support Staff?

9. Selection of Judges. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 44

Which type of selection process should be utilized for judges of the Family Court?

Appendix

A. Juvenile Records and Information Systems: An Overview and Statement of Primary Issues. . . . . 51

B. Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention . . . . . . . . . 59

## CONTENTS

### VOLUME IV: JURISDICTION-DELINQUENCY

Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Issues

1. Definition of Delinquency . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
2. Minimum Age . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

   Should the jurisdiction of juvenile courts be limited only to those defendants over a specific age?

3. Maximum Age . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 9

   At what age should jurisdiction transfer to adult criminal Courts?

4. Age At Which Jurisdiction Attaches. . . . . . . . . . 13

   Should juvenile court jurisdiction be determined by the age of the juvenile at the time the offense occurred, when the youth is arrested, or at some other point in time?

5. Duration of Jurisdiction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 16

   What is the appropriate duration of juvenile court jurisdiction?

6. Waiver. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 20

   Under what circumstances, if any, should the juvenile court waive its jurisdiction over a juvenile offender and direct that he be tried in adult criminal court?

7. Location. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

   Where should a juvenile be tried?

Page

8. Traffic Offenses. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 31

Should any or all traffic offenses be tried in the juvenile court?

Appendix

Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses Prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention . . . . . . . . . . 36

## CONTENTS

### VOLUME V: JURISDICTION--STATUS OFFENSES

Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Issues

1. Jurisdiction Over Status Offenses. . . . . . . . . . 2

   Should the family court have jurisdiction over status offenses?

2. Truancy and Other School-Related Misbehavior . . . 24

   Should school-related behavior be included within the scope of jurisdiction of the family court?

3. Runaway. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 39

   Should the family court have jurisdiction over children who have absented themselves from the home of their parent or guardian without permission?

4. Conduct Dangerous to Self or Others. . . . . . . . 46

   Should the family court have jurisdiction over a juvenile on the basis of conduct which violates no criminal law, but presents a danger to the juvenile or others?

5. Conduct Which Imperils a Juvenile's Morals . . . . 51

   Should the family court have jurisdiction over a child on the basis of conduct which imperils his or her morals?

Appendix

Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 58

# CONTENTS

## VOLUME VI: ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Issues

1. "Dependency" . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

   Should "dependency" constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

2. Specific Definition. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

   Should neglect be specifically defined?

3. Parental Behavior vs. Specific Harms to the Child . . 19

   Should the statutory bases for intervention be defined principally in terms of parental behavior or in terms of specific harms to the child?

4. Abandonment. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

   Should abandonment constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

5. Parental Immorality. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 33

   Should the immorality or socially deviant life-style of a parent constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

6. Parental Mental or Physical Incapacity . . . . . . . 39

   Should the mental or physical incapacity of a parent constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

Page

7. "Lack of Proper Parental Care" . . . . . . . . . . . 45

   Should "lack of proper parental care" constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

8. Physical Abuse . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 53

   Should nonaccidental physical injury constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

9. Unsafe Home Conditions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 61

   Should home conditions jeopardizing safety or health constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should they be defined?

10. Nonsupport . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 68

    Should failure to provide support (when able to do so) constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

11. Medical Care . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 74

    Should failure to provide medical care constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

12. Emotional Harm . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 81

    Should emotional harm constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

13. Sexual Abuse . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 90

    Should sexual abuse constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

Page

14. Delinquent Behavior. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 97

Should delinquent behavior (as a result of parental pressure or approval) constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

15. Unlawful Placement . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 104

Should placement in an unlicensed/inadequate facility constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

16. Disability . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 110

Should the need for special care or educational services because of disability constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

17. Improper Occupation. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 114

Should a child's engaging in a dangerous or improper occupation constitute a basis for family court jurisdiction; and, if so, how should it be defined?

18. Emergency Removal. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 120

What standards should govern emergency removal of endangered children from the home?

19. Rules of Evidence. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 130

What rules of evidence should be employed in the adjudication of endangered child cases?

20. Standard(s) of Proof . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 137

What standard(s) of proof should be employed in the adjudication of endangered child cases?

21. Dispositional Alternatives . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 143

What dispositional alternatives should be available in endangered child proceedings?

Page

22. Removal. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 151

What standards should govern the removal of endangered children from the home?

23. Periodic Review. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 159

What type of periodic review should be employed in post-dispositional monitoring of endangered children?

24. Return . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 168

What standards should govern the return of endangered children to the home?

25. Termination of Parental Rights . . . . . . . . . . . . 175

What standards should govern the termination of parental rights?

Appendix

Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 189

## CONTENTS

## VOLUME VII: PRE-ADJUDICATION AND ADJUDICATION PROCESSES

Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

### Section A. Court Rules Pre-Adjudication and Adjudication Processes

Issue

1. Court Rules . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4

Is there a need for juvenile court rules?

2. Initial Appearance. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 9

Should there be an initial appearance/arraignment (A) for delinquency defendants who are detained and (B) for delinquency defendants who are summoned/cited?

3. Pre-trial Detention . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 16

Should the functions of pre-trial detention in delinquency cases include "preventive detention," or should detention be used only if necessary to assure the juvenile's presence at future court proceedings?

4. Detention Hearings. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23

Should detained juveniles have the right to a judicial hearing to decide whether their detention should continue?

5. Time of Hearing . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 28

Within what time period from placement in detention/shelter care must the detention hearing be held?

Page

6. Conditions of Release . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 32

Should juveniles who are detained pre-trial in delinquency proceedings have the right to release on money bail?

7. Appeal of Detention Decision. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 41

Should the juvenile have a right to appeal from an adverse decision at the detention hearing?

8. Waiver of Counsel; Custodial Admissions . . . . . . . 46

Should the right to counsel be waivable in juvenile delinquency preceedings?

What is the evidentiary status of the juvenile's custodial admission made in the absence of counsel or parent?

9. Probable Cause Hearing. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 54

Should detained juveniles have the right to a probable cause hearing before trial in delinquency cases?

10. Plea Bargaining . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 59

Should plea bargaining practices either be prohibited or regulated?

11. Admissions. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 64

Should Boykin-type procedures apply when a juvenile admits to a delinquency petition?

12. Rights Before Adjudication. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 69

What rights should the defendant enjoy at judicial hearings prior to an adjudication of delinquency?

13. Rules of Evidence . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 92

Should the rules of evidence applied in delinquency proceedings be the same as those in criminal proceedings?

Page

## Section B. Special Considerations Re Discovery

Issue

1. Discovery Procedures. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 104

   Are specific, integrated juvenile court rules or statutes on discovery necessary?

2. Participation of the Judge in Discovery . . . . . . . 106

   To what extent should the discovery process in juvenile cases be self-executing?

3. Reports Submitted at a Waiver Hearing . . . . . . . . 110

   Should a juvenile and his counsel be allowed to examine reports submitted to the court at a waiver hearing?

4. Physical Characteristics. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 117

   Should juveniles be required to submit to being fingerprinted and photographed, to stand for line-ups, speak for voice identification, try on clothing, etc.?

5. Mental Examination. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 122

   Should a mental examination of a child be allowed and should the results be immediately available to the parties or to counsel?

6. Depositions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 127

   Should the state and/or the child be allowed to take and use depositions in juvenile cases?

7. Lists and Statements of Witnesses . . . . . . . . . . 130

   Should the lists and statements of witnesses be discoverable by either side in a juvenile case?

8. Disignated Tangible Objects and Documents . . . . . . 135

   Should documents and tangible objects, intended to be introduced at trial, be disclosed prior to trial?

9. Notice of Defense . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 138

   Should the juvenile have to give notice to the state of defenses intended to be used at trial?

Page

10. Names of Experts and Results of Tests. . . . . . . . 142

Should both sides reveal the names and reports of experts?

11. Social Reports . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 144

Should the reports received and used by a court at the dispositional stage be subject discovery?

12. Police Records of Prior Arrests and Convictions. . . 148

Should police records by available to counsel and parties?

13. Additional Disclosures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 150

Should the judge in juvenile court have the discretion to order additional disclosures which are relevant and material to the case before him?

Appendix

A. Summons; Speedy Trial . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 153

B. Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses Prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 161

## CONTENTS

VOLUME VIII: PROSECUTION AND DEFENSE — Page

Introduction. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Issues

1. Specialization . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

Should the juvenile prosecutor be a separate and specialized prosecutorial unit in each prosecutor's office, where warranted by size, and should he have a well-trained professional and non-professional staff adequate to handle all juvenile cases within his jurisdiction?

2. Representation of the State's Interest . . . . . . . 13

Should an attorney for the State, which we may call the juvenile prosecutor, be present at each stage of every proceeding in the juvenile court in which the State has an interest, including detention, waiver, adjudication, disposition, revocation of probation or parole status, appeals, and collateral attacks upon decisions in these proceedings?

3. Plea Negotiations. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 20

Should the juvenile prosecutor engage in plea discussions in juvenile court; and, if so, to what extent?

4. Filing Petitions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

Should the juvenile prosecutor have the final responsibility concerning the filing of a petition in the juvenile court alleging delinquency?

5. Adversary Role . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35

Should the juvenile prosecutor assume the traditional adversary role of a prosecutor at the adjudicatory phase and all other proceedings of the juvenile court?

Page

6. Dispositional Recommendations and Monitoring. . . . . 41

Should the juvenile prosecutor be permitted to take an active role in the dispositional stage of juvenile court proceedings, including making his own disposition recommendations? Should he also monitor the effectiveness of juvenile court dispositions within his jurisdiction?

Memorandum--Issues Relating to the Role of Defense Counsel in Juvenile Court Proceedings. . . . . . 46

Appendix

A. Petitions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 72

B. Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses Prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. . . . . . . . . . 76

## CONTENTS

## VOLUME IX: JUVENILE DISPOSITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page

Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Overview and Statement of Critical Issues Regarding Juvenile Dispositions and Corrections . . . . . . 3

Issues

1. Dispositional Authority . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 18

   Who should have the authority to determine, impose and subsequently modify a disposition?

2. Duration of Disposition . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

   What should be the limits on juvenile dispositions in terms of time?

3. Dispositional Procedures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42

   What dispositional procedures are appropriate for juvenile proceedings?

4. The Right to Treatment for Juveniles . . . . . . . . . 56

   What are the rights of juveniles to services? What are the obligations of authorities to provide services?

Appendix

A. Intake Guidelines
   Public Input; Restitution
   Ordering Services . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 81

B. Complete Listing of Comparative Analyses Prepared for the National Task Force to Develop Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 93

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1977 0-241-090/26